

# **CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE**

## **AMENDED AGENDA - SPECIAL MEETING**

- Added Consideration Item No. 1 -

### **POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNAL OPERATIONS**

**Mayor Laura Hoffmeister, Chair**  
**Ron Leone, Committee Member**

**5:30 p.m.**  
**Monday, February 1, 2016**

**Wing D, Permit Center Conference Room**  
**1950 Parkside Drive, Concord**

#### **ROLL CALL**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

- 1. CONSIDERATION** – Branding Title for the Replacement to the Civic Hero Application.  
Report by Jeff Lewis, IT Director.
- 2. REVIEW** – User Fees and Charges Study. Report by Karan Reid, Director of Finance.
- 3. ADJOURNMENT**

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and California Law, it is the policy of the City of Concord to offer its public programs, services and meetings in a manner that is readily accessible to everyone, including those with disabilities. If you are disabled and require a copy of a public hearing notice, or an agenda and/or agenda packet in an appropriate alternative format; or if you require other accommodation, please contact the ADA Coordinator at (925) 671-3361, at least five days in advance of the meeting. Advance notification within this guideline will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.

Distribution: City Council  
Valerie Barone, City Manager  
Jovan Grogan, Deputy City Manager  
Brian Libow, Interim City Attorney  
Jeff Lewis, IT Director  
Karan Reid, Finance Director  
Janell Hampton, Budget Officer  
Joelle Fockler, City Clerk

**REPORT TO COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON  
POLICY DEVELOPMENT & INTERNAL OPERATIONS****TO HONORABLE COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

DATE: February 1, 2016

**SUBJECT: BRANDING TITLE FOR THE REPLACEMENT TO THE CIVIC HERO  
APPLICATION****Report in Brief**

This report recommends re-evaluating branding title for Concord's Civic Hero software program with Accela's Citizen Relationship Management system. The Policy Development and Internal Operations (PDIO) Committee met on September 10, 2015 and discussed branding the new citizen relationship management program from Accela as "Concord Civic Hero 2.0". In January, an interdepartmental team began meeting to implement the replacement program. The team identified potential challenges with branding the new application as "Concord Civic Hero 2.0" and recommended "Concord Connect" as an alternative. This report discusses the potential challenges with "Concord Civic Hero 2.0", presents an alternative branding title of "Concord Connect", and requests direction from the Committee on branding for the new mobile reporting application.

**Discussion**

On September 10, the PDIO met to discuss the recommendation to replace "Civic Hero" with Accela Citizen Relationship Management (CRM) system. During the meeting, the Committee discussed branding Accela CRM as "Concord Civic Hero 2.0". The Committee believed that retaining the Civic Hero name would provide continuity and adding a version number would help direct users to new versions (using the nomenclature of 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, etc.; similar to other software vendors that change their version numbers).

As part of the implementation for Accela CRM, an interdepartmental team was established to assist with implementation. When reviewing the branding title for the new application, potential challenges with "Concord Civic Hero 2.0" that were not presented at the September 10 Committee meeting came to light. These potential challenges are:

1. Accela staff recommended against using version numbers in the title. This is due to the way Apple and Google Android mobile applications are updated. If the City changed the application title by updating the version number for this and future improvements, users of the application would need to delete and re-install it each time there was an upgrade. In addition, by changing the title, the application would need to be re-submitted to Apple and Google for approval, which can take two to three weeks and is not included in the current annual maintenance fee that the City will pay to Accela. By using a consistent name, users would follow the standard process for

## CIVIC HERO REPLACEMENT RECOMMENDATION

February 1, 2016

Page 2

updating other applications on their mobile device (i.e. pressing the “Update” button to receive the update without having to delete and then re-install the application).

2. The interdepartmental team expressed a strong desire to move away from the Civic Hero name, as they have received many complaints from residents about the difficulty of using the former application. The team believes that it would be beneficial to brand the new system with a different name to ensure the widest possible adoption of the new application.

To resolve these challenges, the interdepartmental team recommended “Concord Connect” as a branding title.

The implementation timeline from Accela required branding to be completed by January 29. While that date has passed, staff believes that it is important to get direction from the PDIO committee before proceeding with the current branding title of “Concord Civic Hero 2.0” due to the aforementioned information. Should a decision on the branding title be made soon, staff anticipates that implementation can still proceed on schedule, with completion by March 31, 2016.

### **Fiscal Impact**

There is no fiscal impact for continuing to use “Concord Civic Hero 2.0” or rebranding the name to “Concord Connect”.

### **Public Contact**

Posting of the Council Agenda.

### **Recommended Action**

Staff requests direction from the Committee on branding for the new mobile reporting application.



---

Jovan Grogan  
Deputy City Manager  
[jovan.Grogan@cityofconcord.org](mailto:jovan.Grogan@cityofconcord.org)

Prepared by: Jeff Lewis  
Director Information Technology  
[jeff.lewis@cityofconcord.org](mailto:jeff.lewis@cityofconcord.org)

**REPORT TO POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNAL OPERATIONS  
COMMITTEE****TO THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND VICE-MAYOR:**

DATE: February 1, 2016

**SUBJECT: USER FEES AND CHARGES STUDY****Report in Brief**

On December 10, 2015, Policy Development and Internal Operations (PDIO) Committee received a overview report from the City's consultant, NBS, on the Citywide Cost Allocation Plan and User Fees and Charges Study project that was initiated in September 2013. The Committee provided feedback to staff, and confirmed the next steps towards consideration of a Fee Recovery Policy and updated Master Fee Schedule.

At the February 1, 2016 meeting, the Committee will review the Draft User Fees and Charges Report and consider a Fee Recovery Policy. This report transmits NBS's draft report, recommends a User Fee Cost Recovery Policy, and outlines next steps.

**Background**

In September 2013, a City-wide Cost Allocation Plan and User Fee Analysis project was initiated. This project proceeded in two phases that were undertaken by a consultant (NBS, Inc.) and managed by staff in the Finance Department. The first phase was to prepare an updated Cost Allocation Plan, which spreads the cost of general government and support services across the direct services provided to the public. This phase was completed in January 2015. The second phase was an analysis of the City's user fees to confirm and update the efforts entailed in providing each of the City's services and programs. From this analysis, the Committee, and subsequently the City Council, will be asked to establish a fee recovery policy and update the City's fee schedule.

Propositions 13, 218 and 26 have placed both substantive and procedural limits on cities' ability to impose fees and charges. Collectively these constitutional amendments provide safeguards against taxes being imposed without a vote of the people. Proposition 26 contains a more general articulation of the cost of service principle and includes a requirement that the local government bear the burden of proof that [1] "a levy, charge, or other exaction is not a tax, [2] that the amount is no more than necessary to recover the reasonable costs of the government activity, and [3] that the manner in which those costs are allocated to a payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payor's burden on, or benefits received from, the governmental activity." (Cal. Const. art. XIII C, § (e)). It is important to note that rental charges for rooms or facilities, fines, penalties and late charges are not technically user fees and are not required to be based on actual costs. Instead, these types of charges are more typically governed by market rates, reasonableness and other policy driven factors and can legally exceed the cost.

**CITY OF CONCORD USER FEES AND CHARGES STUDY**

February 1, 2016

Page 2

**Discussion**

This section provides a summary of the draft NBS report, recommends policy considerations for a proposed User Fee Cost Recovery Policy, and responds to PDIO information requests.

***NBS Draft User Fees and Charges Report***

Attachment A is NBS’s draft report dated December 1, 2015. NBS’s report was based on FY 2014/15 budget data and estimated annual fee revenue. Given the actual FY 2014/15 activity level, fee charged, and cost, the report provides the various cost recovery levels for fees and General Fund subsidies related to Planning, Engineering, Building, Police and Parks and Recreation. Administrative fees, such as processing fees for business licenses and permits, non-CED appeals and subpoena fees, were also reviewed but only an analysis of the fee level was performed. Due to the low volume of activity for administrative fees, projections were not done to calculate the total projected annual revenue.

<b>Department/Division</b>	<b>Estimated Annual Current Fee Revenue</b>	<b>Eligible Cost Recovery from User/Regulatory Fee Revenue</b>	<b>Annual Cost Recovery Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	<b>Current Cost Recovery Percentage</b>
CED Planning	\$ 506,600	\$ 835,843	\$ (329,243)	61%
CED Gen Plan Surcharge	233,438	583,594	(350,156)	40%
CED Engineering	1,044,000	1,039,821	4,179	100%
CED Building	2,761,852	2,764,001	(2,149)	100%
CED Technology Surcharge	0	260,401	(260,401)	0%
Police	124,252	99,397	24,855	125%
Parks and Recreation	4,117,223	7,354,089	(3,236,866)	56%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,787,365</b>	<b>\$ 12,937,146</b>	<b>\$ (4,149,781)</b>	<b>68%</b>

Overall, NBS’s analysis indicates that the City recovered approximately 68% of the full cost of providing fee related services in FY 2014/15 for the departments/divisions mentioned above. Thus, the City’s General Fund subsidized 32%, or approximately \$4.1 million, of the cost of these services. As expected, cost recovery levels varied quite a bit between departments and programs. Based on that analysis, NBS also identified that 73 of the approximately 540 fees analyzed generated a cost recovery level above 100%. These fees do not meet the above described criteria to be set above 100% of the actual cost. Thus, in order to ensure that the City does not charge users fees with a cost recovery level above 100% based on estimated FY 2013/14 activity levels, adopted fees, and budgeted costs, staff recommends reductions to FY 2016/17 Fees to bring them to a 100% cost recovery level.

***Fees Charged in Other Cities***

NBS reviewed fees charged by five neighboring cities (Walnut Creek, Brentwood, Antioch, Pittsburg and Dublin) in order to understand how Concord’s fees place in comparison to these agencies (see Appendix B to Attachment A). It is important to note that conclusions that can be drawn from comparisons of fee levels across the surveyed cities are fairly limited due to agencies’ differences in defining and structuring their

respective fees. For example, certain services included in fees may be combined in some cities but separated in others; fees in other cities may be based on historical or other subjective factors unrelated to costs; and fees are also affected by differences in cost factors such as cost allocations of indirect support costs, employee benefit costs, community priorities and service efficiencies.

### *User Fee Cost Recovery Policy Considerations*

As a best practice, Governmental Finance Officers' Association (GFOA) recommends public agencies adopt formal policies regarding fees and charges. The City of Concord has a long history being fiscally prudent through the adoption of sound budget and financial policies such as maintaining the 10-Year Financial Forecast. Adopting a Fee Recovery Policy will strengthen the City's budget policies further.

NBS's presentation on December 10, 2015 included an introduction into policy considerations for setting cost recovery levels. Based on NBS's report and a review of other cities' user fee cost recovery policies, the following policy considerations are presented to the Committee for discussion.

1. Community-wide vs. Private Benefit: The use of taxpayer dollars is appropriate for services that benefit the community as a whole such as police patrol services. When the service or program provides a benefit to specific individuals or groups such as the issuance of building permits, it is common for the individual(s) receiving that benefit to pay for all of the cost of that service.
2. Service Recipient vs. Service Driver: The concept of the service recipient vs. service driver is particularly important for regulated activities such as development review and police issued permits. It could be argued that the applicant is not the beneficiary of the City's development review efforts: the community is the primary beneficiary. However, the applicant is the driver of development review costs, and as such, cost recovery from the applicant is appropriate.
3. Consistency with City Goals and Policies: City policies and Council goals related to the community's quality of life may also be factors in setting cost recovery levels. For example, fee levels can be set to promote city-wide goals, facilitate environmental stewardship, encourage compliance with City regulations (e.g. water heater permits) or discourage certain actions (e.g. false alarms).
4. Elasticity of Demand for Services: The level of cost recovery can affect the demand for services. A higher level of cost recovery could ensure the City is providing services such as recreational classes or summer camps for children and youth without overly-stimulating a market by artificially low prices. Such low prices, which are a reflection of a high General Fund subsidy, may attract participants from other cities. Conversely, high cost recovery levels could negatively impact the demand for such services to low income individuals, children, or seniors. It should be noted, that the current Master Fee Schedule for recreational services includes a lower rate for Concord residents than residents living outside of Concord.
5. Availability of Services from the Private Sector: High cost recovery levels are generally sought in situations where the service is available from other sources in order to preserve taxpayer funds for core City services. Conversely, services that are not available from other sources and are typically delivered when residents experience an emergency typically have low or zero cost recovery levels.

**CITY OF CONCORD USER FEES AND CHARGES STUDY**

February 1, 2016

Page 4

Based on these policy considerations, the following table overlays certain cost recovery levels grouped in low (0-30%), medium (30.1% to 70%), and high (70.1% to 100%) cost recovery percentage ranges. It is important to note that these groupings provide guidance and are not absolute. Some policy considerations may weigh more heavily than others, which will be considered in the development of the Fee Cost Recovery Policy and reflected in the FY 2016-17 Proposed Master Fee Schedule. For example, cities sometimes choose to set fees for recreational activities at the Medium cost recovery level. Additionally, cities often set permits for development activity at 100% cost recovery level.

<b>Cost Recovery Levels</b>	<b>Cost Recovery Percentage Range</b>	<b>Policy Considerations (one or all may apply)</b>
Low	0% – 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public at large benefits even if they are not the direct users of the service</li> <li>• No intended relationship between the amount paid and the benefit received</li> <li>• Fee collection would not be cost effective and/or would discourage compliance with regulatory requirements</li> <li>• No intent to limit the use of the service</li> <li>• Affordability of service to low-income residents</li> </ul>
Medium	30.1% - 70%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services having factors associated with the low and high cost recovery levels</li> </ul>
High	70.1% - 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual users or participants receive most or all of the benefit of the service</li> <li>• Other private or public sector alternatives provide the service</li> <li>• The use of the service is specifically discouraged</li> <li>• The service is regulatory in nature</li> </ul>

The City currently has no formal policies in place governing cost recovery targets for user fee services. Based on the Committee’s review and discussion, staff recommends presenting a draft User Fee Cost Recovery policy along with the Draft User Fees and Charges Report to the City Council at a Study Session in March. Such a policy will then inform the development of the FY 2016/17 Proposed Master Fee Schedule.

Attachment B provides examples of fee recovery policies for the Cities of San Luis Obispo, Sacramento and Palo Alto.

### *Annual Inflator for Setting Fees*

Typically, a comprehensive fee update is performed every 5 years. At the December 10 meeting, the Committee requested information on the advantages and disadvantages of using different indices for making annual adjustments to fees in the interim years between comprehensive fee updates. Generally, fees are adjusted by either a Consumer Price Index (CPI) or change in Labor Costs.

Changes in Consumer Price Index will reflect overall economic changes for the region and are easily obtained through the Bureau of Labor Statistics. However, the CPI adjustment may not be representative of the actual change in costs borne by the City. Since labor and benefit costs represent approximately 71% of the City's General Fund budget, annual changes in labor costs may be a more reflective indicator to use for setting fees.

It is a best practice and a recommendation of NBS to include an automatic inflator in the fee resolution and to disclose specifically what is to be used in that Resolution. Generally, labor cost is more closely tied to the "actual cost," as this category represents the majority of costs in providing user fee services.

### *Staff Recommendations/Fee Study Results*

In consideration of the above analysis regarding fee recovery policies, staff makes the following recommendations to the City's current fees. Each is discussed in detail following this summary.

- Transition to full cost recovery for Planning activities
- Increase the General Plan Surcharge
- Implement a Development Review Technology Surcharge
- Waive Business License Application and Renewal fees for online processing
- Recalibrate fees for Engineering, Building and Police
- No changes in fees for Parks and Recreation

### Planning Fees

Currently, Planning fee levels recover about 61% of actual staff costs for private development entitlement (permit) processing. As a result, the City's General Fund subsidizes the cost of private development processing by approximately 39%.

The policy guidance for cost recovery discussed in the User Fees and Charges Study (Attachment A, page 8) is "that when a service or activity completely benefits an individual or entity, it can be reasonably argued that 100% of the cost should be recovered from fees collected from the individual or entity". Conversely, if the public at large derives some benefit from the service or activity, there is reasonable justification to subsidize the cost of providing the service or activity through the general fund. This line of reasoning would indicate that fees for private development application processing should strive toward 100%

cost recovery, except in those instances where a project or activity will result in a benefit to the public as a whole.

With that understanding, staff recommends that private development planning fees be adjusted to allow recovery of the actual staff costs of most private development entitlement, except in a few fee categories where public benefit moderates the appropriate percentage of cost recovery. Therefore, staff recommends that the following Planning permit fees continue to be partially subsidized because of the public benefit provided: (1) large family day care applications, (2) appeals of private development approvals, (3) second family (in-law) unit applications, and (4) code enforcement actions.

Large family day care facilities, which provide day care in residential homes for between 7-14 children, are greatly needed to support working families, but can result in neighborhood controversy. The day care operator is rarely able to afford the actual cost of processing and public review of these applications, public hearing notification of the surrounding neighborhood, the cost of extensive staff work associated with the review and approval documentation, representation in public meetings, etc. Further commentary and request for reduction of the existing Large Family Day Care permit fee is provided by the Contra Costa Child Care Council in Attachment C.

The fee to process an Appeal of a Planning Approval is often subsidized by a City or other public entity to ensure that those who protest a new development or permit approval are not hindered by lack of substantial funds. A neighborhood or business district may be negatively impacted by a new development approval and, unlike the applicant, these groups do not benefit from the new development or granting of a permit for a new use. If appellants had to bear the burden of the true cost of an appeal process, it would likely have a chilling impact on their ability to appeal a Planning approval or zoning determination.

Secondary family units are seen as an affordable housing opportunity and a public benefit for the city. The need for affordable housing has been growing in Concord as prices and rents have increased over the last three years. In particular, there is demand for affordable housing in and near the downtown that is close to transit services. The City currently subsidizes Secondary unit permit fees by reducing them to half the level of single family dwelling unit fees, and staff is proposing a pilot project to further reduce secondary unit fees, corresponding to a secondary unit fee reduction implemented by the Contra Costa Water District. Concurrent with this process, but on a separate track, this Committee is reviewing the secondary unit fee reduction, which (if approved) will then be forwarded to the City Council for consideration.

Code Enforcement activity often involves an initial notice of violation, with a given time period for project compliance. If the subject property is not brought into compliance, the owner may be cited with a \$100 fine, or additional fines, for as long as the violation continues. Frequently the staff involved in a Code Enforcement action includes several divisions, such as Planning, Engineering, Code Enforcement, and the City Attorney's Office, and the cost of staff time is not recouped. Development Code Enforcement activities are subsidized by the City to ensure abatement of nuisances and blight occur, which is a public benefit citywide.

For all other categories, such as Design Review, Minor and Major Use Permits, Re-zonings, General Plan Amendments, and other discretionary planning permits, planning fees are recommended to be set at 100% cost recovery.

Cost Recovery Policy Impacts. Over the past 4 years, the number of planning applications has increased by 43%, with a steady rise in the number of applications received annually. The size and complexity of proposed development projects has also increased during this period. Additionally, the City must comply with more State rules and regulations further adding to the complexity of the review.. During the recession, three Planner positions were eliminated, and none have been reinstated. This reduction represented a loss of 38% of the professional Planning staff capacity in the City. Between the significant increase in development activity due to the good news of economic recovery, and the reduced Planning Division staffing that the City continues to operate with, Planning staff is challenged to provide timely processing of all current applications and other required activities.

Staff's recommendation to increase Planning processing application fees for private development will allow the City to be appropriately reimbursed for the Planning staff costs to process these applications and will reduce the burden on the general fund. Moreover, it will capture the actual cost of the providing Planning permit processing and allow the City to increase the number of staff needed as the work load continues to increase.

Providing sufficient Planning staff resources is an extremely important economic development tool, ensuring that the entitlement process does not become unreasonably extended, and that the General Plan, Climate Action Plan and other advanced planning requirements are up to date, legally defensible and compliant with State law.

#### General Plan Maintenance and Update Surcharge

To ensure that sufficient funds are available for the General Plan Update activities, staff is recommending increasing this surcharge fee by 10%, allowing a 50% recovery of the operational costs of these activities. The City is current recovering 40% of its costs through a surcharge on building permits, at the current rate of .25 % of the building permit valuation. This fee has recovered \$233,438 in 2015. The actual average amount that needs to be generated each year is approximately \$584,000. This is based on budgeting for a comprehensive General Plan Update every 10 years, as well as interim advanced planning efforts, such as funding the Housing Element Update (approved in January, 2015), the Subdivision Ordinance Update (currently underway) and other such long-range plans and updates to plans.

Staff recommends increasing the General Plan Maintenance and Update Surcharge to achieve 50% cost recovery, so that the new surcharge fee would be increased to .31% building permit valuation. With this proposed increase, the Master Fee Study estimates the surcharge would yield approximately \$292,000 per year, an increase of about \$58,000 each year.

#### Development Review Technology Surcharge

Currently the City of Concord does not have any funding source, other than General Funds, for the purchase, maintenance, and replacement costs of software and technology hardware utilized to provide Development Review services. Without a dedicated funding source it is very difficult for the City to implement necessary technology improvements and upgrades to address key City initiatives, such as moving to a completely paperless development permit process and implementation of an online permit process. Also,

the City has not been in a strong financial position to replace outdated technology after the useful life of current technology has been reached.

To address this unfunded cost of development review, a Development Review Technology Surcharge is proposed to fund the purchase, maintenance and replacement of Development Review services software and hardware. The proposed Technology Surcharge is a 7% surcharge that would be collected as part of the Planning, Engineering, and Building administrative processing, plan review, and inspection fees. The estimated recurring fiscal cost of Development Review technology, which includes the replacement cost, is \$265,000 per year, as outlined in the User Fees and Charges Study. A technology replacement period for key technology software of 10 years and for technology hardware of 5 years has been used for analysis purposes.

Staff evaluated several methods that are used in other jurisdictions to impose a Technology Surcharge, including combinations of fixed fees per application, a surcharge per billable hour, and a valuation-based fee. The best method is to charge a percentage of actual Development Review service revenues because it directly relates to the level of development review services provided for each project. This surcharge is estimated to meet the targeted annual cost of the technology needs of the Development Review process.

#### Business License Application and Renewal Fees

Staff recommends an incentive for business owners to renew and apply on-line with the elimination of the administrative processing fee for on-line business license processing. Businesses using the traditional method of mailing in their renewals would continue to pay the \$18 processing fee. The City's third party software program will be upgraded in the upcoming months and be able to accept online applications and renewals of business licenses. Not only will this expedite processing of the applications and renewals, online processing will reduce the manual processes associated with printing, mailing and filing applications and decrease time spent on the associated banking. This will allow staff to focus on new business discovery and auditing business returns.

Currently, the City charges an \$18 processing fee for each business license application and renewal and generates approximately \$165,000 annually. The City licenses approximately 9,200 businesses and only about 30% or 2,800 renew online. Conversely, Walnut Creek licenses approximately 7,300 businesses and about 63% or 4,500 renew online and about 40% of new business license applications are processed electronically. Should the City be successful in encouraging half of the City's businesses to process their renewals online, the fiscal impact would be a revenue reduction of \$83,000. However, our system would be much more efficient and provide staff additional time for new business discovery and improved auditing of business tax returns.

#### Recalibrate Fees to Fully Recover City Costs

Historically, fees have been set to fully recover costs for fees that relate to permits (not law enforcement) in the Police Department and in the Engineering and Building Divisions. Process and technology changes have occurred since the last user fee study was performed, which has decreased processing costs for some services. To ensure compliance with State law and to fully recover the costs associated with providing the services,

# CITY OF CONCORD USER FEES AND CHARGES STUDY

February 1, 2016

Page 9

staff recommends recalibrating fees in Engineering, Building and Police to capture actual costs of providing services.

## Status Quo for Park and Recreation Fees

Since the fees are primarily market driven, no change is recommended for fees for Parks and Recreation. Rather, staff recommends the City continue with its current process in establishing and adjusting fees by periodically conducting competitive market studies to determine and position recreational programs, facilities and services to attract sufficient participation levels at appropriate price points. Maximizing use of recreation facility assets is an important factor when considering fee increases. Prices charged for recreation programs are often the single greatest determinant of demand.

## Summary User Fee Study Results

The consultant has estimated the impact of the above changes, as follows:

Department/Division	Estimated Annual Current Fee Revenue	Current Cost Recovery Percentage	Amount of Costs Recovered per Staff Recommended Fees	Staff Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
CED Planning	\$ 506,600	61%	\$ 835,843	100%
CED Gen Plan Surcharge	233,438	40%	291,797	50%
CED Engineering	1,044,000	100%	1,039,821	100%
CED Building	2,761,852	100%	2,750,225	100%
CED Technology Surcharge	-	-	260,401	100%
Police	124,252	125%	99,397	100%
Parks and Recreation	4,117,223	56%	4,117,223	56%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,787,365</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>\$ 9,394,707</b>	<b>73%</b>

The City could recover an additional \$600,000 annually. Approximately \$260,000 would be restricted for supporting development process technology needs and \$58,000 would be earmarked for the General Plan update, leaving about \$280,000 to offset the costs of providing these fee services.

**Recommendation for Action**

Provide direction to staff on fee recovery policy, recommended changes to the Master Fee Schedule and confirm next steps, which are outlined below:

*Next Steps*

- Receive direction from the Committee on how to proceed with the above fee recommendations
- Receive direction from the Committee on the development of a Draft User Fee Cost Recovery Policy
- Return to the Committee to review the Draft User Fee Cost Recovery Policy
- Present Draft User Fee Cost Recovery Policy along with the Draft User Fee Report to the City Council at a Study Session in March
- Fee Recovery Policy and Master Fee Schedule Adoption by the City Council in March/April

**Fiscal Impact**

The Draft User Fees and Charges Study report provides information as to the costs to provide various City services and programs. From this information, the Committee and ultimately, the City Council, may consider a fee recovery policy that could decrease the reliance on General Fund revenues in the provision of certain services and programs.

Prepared by: Karan Reid  
Finance Director  
[Karan.Reid@cityofconcord.org](mailto:Karan.Reid@cityofconcord.org)



---

Jovan Grogan  
Deputy City Manager  
[Jovan.Grogan@cityofconcord.org](mailto:Jovan.Grogan@cityofconcord.org)

Attachments:

1. Attachment A: Draft User Fees and Charges Study report
2. Attachment B: User Fee Recovery Policies for San Luis Obispo, Sacramento, Palo Alto
3. Attachment C: Contra Costa County Child Care Council request letter

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **NBS DRAFT USER FEES AND CHARGES STUDY REPORT**



**City of Concord**

**User Fees and Charges Study**

**Final Report DRAFT – December 1, 2015**

32605 Temecula Parkway, Suite 100  
Temecula, CA 92592  
Toll free: 800.434.8349 Fax: 951.296.1998

December 1, 2015

Ms. Karen Reid  
Director of Finance  
City of Concord  
1950 Parkside Dr.  
Concord, CA 94519

**Transmittal: Cost of Service Study for Analyzing User Fees and Regulatory Fees**

Dear Ms. Reid:

NBS respectfully submits the enclosed report comprising our efforts to prepare a cost of service analysis of user fees and regulatory fees for the City of Concord.

We have shared in this document our complete array of work products. Upon review, discussion, and acceptance of this report by the City Council, we will finalize. If we have omitted any area of importance you hoped we would address through this process, do not hesitate to communicate with us so that we fully meet the City's needs.

We wish to extend our gratitude to you and the directors and representatives of each department studied for your contributions of time, knowledge, data, and insight, which have been invaluable through this process. We thank you for this opportunity to serve Concord, and we welcome your continued interaction with us should you need any advice or assistance on this or another topic in the future.

Sincerely,



Greta Davis  
Associate Director of Financial Consulting

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	3
<b>Purpose</b> .....	3
<b>Outcomes</b> .....	3
<b>Report Format</b> .....	4
Section 1 – Introduction and Fundamentals .....	4
<b>Scope of Study</b> .....	4
<b>Methods of Analysis</b> .....	5
Cost of Service Analysis.....	5
Cost Recovery Evaluation.....	8
Comparative Fee Survey .....	10
<b>Data Sources</b> .....	11
Section 2 – CED Planning .....	12
<b>Cost of Service Analysis</b> .....	12
<b>Cost Recovery Evaluation</b> .....	13
<b>Proposed Fees</b> .....	14
Section 3 – CED Engineering.....	15
<b>Cost of Service Analysis</b> .....	15
<b>Cost Recovery Evaluation</b> .....	16
<b>Proposed Fees</b> .....	16
Section 4 –CED Building Fees.....	17
Section 5 – Police Fees.....	19
<b>Cost of Service Analysis</b> .....	19
<b>Cost Recovery Evaluation</b> .....	19
<b>Proposed Fees</b> .....	20
Section 6 – Admin Fees .....	21
<b>Cost of Service Analysis</b> .....	21
<b>Cost Recovery Evaluation</b> .....	21
<b>Proposed Fees</b> .....	22
Section 7 – Parks and Recreation Fees .....	23
<b>Impacts of Proposition 26 on Recreation Fee Analysis</b> .....	24

<b>Cost of Service Analysis</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Cost Recovery Evaluation</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>Fee Establishment</b> .....	<b>26</b>
Section 8 – General Plan Maintenance Surcharge.....	27
<b>General Plan Maintenance and Update Surcharge</b> .....	<b>27</b>
Section 9 – Conclusion.....	29

**Appendices**

**Cost of Service Analysis**

**Appendix A**

CED Planning, Engineering and Building	Appendix A.1
CED Engineering (included in Appendix A.1)	Appendix A.1
CED Building	Appendix A.2
Police	Appendix A.3
Admin	Appendix A.4
Parks and Recreation	Appendix A.5

**Comparative Fee Survey**

**Appendix B**

CED Planning	Appendix B.1
CED Engineering	Appendix B.2
CED Building	Appendix B.3
Police	Appendix B.4
Admin	Appendix B.5
Parks and Recreation	Appendix B.6

## Executive Summary

### Purpose

The purpose of this report is to describe the findings and recommendations of the study performed by NBS intended to update and establish user and regulatory fees for service for the City of Concord, California.

It is generally accepted in California that cities are granted the authority to impose these user fees and regulatory fees for services and activities they provide through provisions of the State Constitution. First, cities are granted the ability to perform broad activities related to their local policing power and other service authority as defined in Article XI, Sections 7 and 9. Second, cities are granted the ability to establish fees for service through the framework defined in Article XIII B, Section 8. Under this latter framework, a fee may not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service or performing the activity. For a fee to qualify as such, it must relate to a service or activity under the control of the individual/entity on which the fee is imposed. For example, the individual/entity requests service of the municipality or his or her actions specifically cause the municipality to perform additional activities. In this manner, the service or the underlying action causing the municipality to perform service is either discretionary and/or is subject to regulation. As a discretionary service or regulatory activity, the user fees and regulatory fees considered in this study fall outside requirements that must otherwise be followed by the City to impose taxes, special taxes, or fees imposed as incidences of property ownership.

The City's chief purposes in conducting this study were to ensure that existing fees were calibrated to the costs of service and to provide an opportunity for the City Council to optimize its revenue sources, provided that any increased cost recovery from user fees and regulatory fees would not conflict with broader City goals and values.

### Outcomes

The cost of service study examined user and regulatory fees managed by the following City departments and divisions:

- CED Planning
- CED Engineering
- CED Building
- Police
- Admin (*cost analysis performed at unit fee level*)
- Parks and Recreation

The cost of service analysis identified approximately \$12.9 million eligible for recovery from fees examined as part of this study. The table on the following page provides a breakdown of the Study's results by department or division studied:

Department / Division	Estimated Annual Current Fee Revenue	Eligible Cost Recovery from User / Regulatory Fee Revenue	Annual Cost Recovery Surplus / (Deficit)	Current Cost Recovery Percentage
CED Planning	\$ 506,600	\$ 1,096,244	\$ (589,644)	46%
CED Planning - General Plan Surcharge	\$ 233,438	\$ 583,594	\$ (350,156)	40%
CED Engineering	1,044,000	1,039,821	4,179	100%
CED Building	2,761,852	2,764,001	(2,149)	100%
Police	124,252	99,397	24,855	125%
Parks and Recreation	4,117,223	7,354,089	(3,236,866)	56%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,787,365</b>	<b>\$ 12,937,146</b>	<b>\$ (4,149,782)</b>	<b>68%</b>

Overall, the City is recovering approximately 68% of user and regulatory fee related services. The services included on the Admin fee portion of the schedule have not been included in the total above, as the volume of activity has not been historically tracked, therefore the cost analysis was performed at the unit fee level.

**Report Format**

This report documents the analytical methods and data sources used throughout the study, presents analytical results regarding current levels of cost recovery achieved from user and regulatory fees, and provides a comparative survey of fees imposed by neighboring agencies for similar services.

- Section 1 of the report outlines the foundation of the study and general approach.
- Sections 2 through 8 discuss the results of the cost of service analysis performed, segmented by category of fee and/or department. The analysis applied to each category/department falls into studies of: the fully-burdened hourly rate(s), the calculation of the costs of providing service, the cost recovery policies of each fee category, and the recommended fees for providing services.
- Section 9 provides the grand scope conclusions of the analysis provided in the preceding sections.
- Appendices to this report include detailed analytical results for each department or division studied, and a comparison of fees imposed by neighboring agencies for similar services.

The initial outcomes of this Study will be presented to City Council in a Study Session for their review and comment. At the time actual fee amounts are proposed for adoption, the City's staff report will include a Master Fee Schedule document, which incorporates recommendations contained within this report as well as the review and input provided by City Council.

**Section 1 – Introduction and Fundamentals**

**Scope of Study**

The following categories of fees were examined in this study.

- CED Planning services, including:
  - Plan reviews, use permits, certificates of compliance, variances, and subdivisions of land.

- CED Engineering services, including:
  - Plan Review and Inspection of Public and Private Improvements including improvements, repair and maintenance in the City's public right-of-way.
- CED Building services, including:
  - Plan Review and Inspection and Building Code Compliance of New Construction, Remodels, Alterations Plan Review and Inspection.
- Police services, including:
  - Alarm permit, film permits, report copies, vehicle impound release, and citation sign-off fees.
- Admin services, including:
  - Business processing fees, copy fees, subpoena fees, etc.
- Parks and Recreation services, including:
  - Recreation programs and classes, day camps, park and facility permits, and senior and social services fees.

The fees examined in this study specifically excluded utility rates, development impact fees, and special assessments, all of which fall under distinct analytical and procedural requirements different from the body of user/regulatory fees analyzed in this effort. Additionally, this study and the resultant master fee schedule excluded most of the fines and penalties that may be imposed by the City for violations to its requirements or code, unless the City specifically asked NBS to identify the estimated and reasonable cost of the service as part of the study. The City is not limited to the costs of service when imposing fines and penalties.

## Methods of Analysis

There were three primary phases of analysis used throughout this Cost of Service Study:

- 1) Cost of service analysis;
- 2) Cost recovery evaluation; and
- 3) Fee establishment.

## Cost of Service Analysis

A cost of service analysis is a quantitative effort that compiles the full cost of providing governmental services and activities. There are two primary types of costs considered: direct and indirect costs. Direct costs are those that specifically relate to the activity in question, including the real-time provision of the service. Indirect costs are those that support the provision of services but cannot be directly or easily assigned to the activity in question. An example of a direct cost is the salary and benefit expense associated with an individual performing a service. In the same example, an indirect cost would include the expenses incurred to provide an office and equipment for that individual to perform his or her duties, including (but not exclusive to) the provision of the service in question.

Components of the full cost of service include direct labor costs, indirect labor costs, specific direct non-labor costs where applicable, allocated non-labor costs, and allocated organization-wide overhead. Definitions of these cost components are as follows:

- Labor costs – These are the salary/wage and benefits expenses for City personnel specifically involved in the provision of services and activities to the public.
- Indirect labor costs – These are the salary/wage and benefits expenses for City personnel supporting the provision of services and activities. This can include line supervision and departmental management, administrative support within a department, and staff involved in technical activities related to the direct services provided to the public.
- Specific direct non-labor costs – These are discrete expenses incurred by the City due to a specific service or activity performed, such as contractor costs, third-party charges, and very specific materials used in the service or activity. (In most fee types, this component is not used, as it is very difficult to directly assign most non-labor costs at the activity level.)
- Allocated indirect non-labor costs – These are expenses other than labor for the departments involved in the provision of services. In most cases, these costs are allocated across all services provided by a department, rather than directly assigned to fee categories.
- Allocated indirect organization-wide overhead – These are expenses, both labor and non-labor, related to the City's agency-wide support services. Support services includes general administrative services provided internally across the City's departments by the City Manager's Office, the City Clerk, the City Attorney, the Human Resources Department, and the City's Finance Department, as well as cost burdens for building use, building maintenance, and Information Technology support. These support services departments provide functions to the direct providers of public service, such as human resources, payroll, financial management, and other similar business functions. The amount of costs attributable to each department or division included in this study were developed through a separate Cost Allocation Plan.

These cost components were expressed using annual (or annualized) figures, representing a twelve-month cycle of expenses incurred by the City in the provision of all services and activities agency-wide.

Nearly all of the fees under review in this study require specific actions on the part of City staff to provide the service or conduct the activity. Because labor is an underlying factor in these activities, the full cost of service was most appropriately expressed as a fully burdened cost per available labor hour. This labor rate – expressed as an individual composite rate, or composite rate by activity (such as plan review, inspection or processing) for each division in the City's organization; which served as the basis for further quantifying the average full cost of providing individual services and activities.

To derive the fully burdened labor rate for each department, and various functional divisions within a department, two figures were required: the full costs of service and the number of hours available to perform those services. The full costs of service were quantified generally through the earlier steps described in this analysis. The number of hours was derived from a complete listing of all personnel employed by the City and reflected in the labor expenses embedded in the full cost of service.

Each City employee was assigned a full-time equivalent factor. An employee working full-time would have a factor of 1.0; an employee working exactly half-time would have a factor of 0.5. A full-time employee is paid for roughly 2,080 hours per year of regular time. Using this as an initial benchmark of labor time, each

employee's full-time equivalent factor was applied to this amount of hours to generate the total number of regular paid hours in each department.

Next, each employee's annual paid leave hours were approximated. Paid leave included holidays, vacation, sick leave, and any other regular leave indicated in personnel data. Once quantified for the entire department, annual paid leave hours were removed from the total number of regular paid hours to generate the total number of available labor hours in each department. These available hours represent the amount of productive time during which services and activities can be performed.

The productive labor hours were then divided into the annual full costs of service to derive a composite fully burdened labor rate for each department/division. This schedule of composite labor rates by department/division was used in this Fee Study to quantify costs at an individual fee level. It should be noted, however, that the composite labor rates may also be used by the City for other purposes when the need arises to calculate the full cost of general services. For nearly all services and activities in a governmental agency – not just those reflected in a fee schedule – labor time is the most accessible and reasonable underlying variable.

Once fully burdened labor rates were developed, they could be used at the individual fee level to estimate an average full cost of providing each service or activity. This step required the development of staff time estimates for the services and activities listed in the master fee schedule. Although the City's time tracking records were extremely useful in identifying time spent providing general categories of service (e.g. plan review, inspection, public assistance, etc.), the City does not systematically track activity service time at a level of detail that could be used to provide estimated time required to perform an individual request for service. Consequently, interviews and questionnaires were used to develop the necessary data sets describing estimated labor time. In most cases, departments were asked to estimate the average amount of time (in minutes and hours) it would take to complete a typical occurrence of each service or activity considered. Every attempt was made to ensure that each department having a direct role in the provision of each service or activity provided a time estimate.

It should be noted that the development of these time estimates was not a one-step process: estimates received were carefully reviewed by both consultant and departmental management to assess the reasonableness of such estimates. Based on this review, sometimes estimates were reconsidered until all parties were comfortable that they reasonably reflected average workload at the City. Once finalized, the staff time estimates were then applied to the fully burdened labor rate for each department and functional division to yield an average full cost of the service or activity.

The average full cost of service was just that: an average cost at the individual fee level. The City does not currently have the systems in place to impose fees for every service or activity based on the actual amount of time it takes to serve each individual. Moreover, such an approach is almost universally infeasible without significant – if not unreasonable – investments in costly technology. Much of the City's fee schedule is composed of flat fees, which by definition, are linked to an average cost of service; thus, use of this average cost method was the predominant approach in proceeding toward a schedule of revised fees. Flat fee structures based on average costs of service are widely applied among other California municipalities, and it is a generally accepted approach. (Refer to the subsection below regarding "Fee Establishment" for further discussion.)

The above-described steps were used for each department to describe the costs of general services, including those activities related to an existing or newly considered fee. For several subsets of fees, some

deviations in analytical methods were taken to provide supplemental information in defining the full costs of services.

The complete cost of service analysis developed for each department or division considered in this study are discussed in the subsequent chapters and appendices of this report.

## Cost Recovery Evaluation

Current levels of cost recovery from existing fee revenues were stated simply by comparing the existing fee for each service or activity – if a fee was imposed – to the average full cost of service quantified through this analysis. Cost recovery was expressed as a percentage of the full cost. A cost recovery rate of 0% means no costs are recovered from fee revenues. A rate of 100% means that the full cost of service is recovered from the fee. A rate between 0% and 100% indicated partial recovery of the full cost of service through fees. A rate greater than 100% means that the fee exceeded the full cost of service.

User fees and regulatory fees examined in this study should not exceed the full cost of service. In other words, the cost recovery rate achieved by a fee should not be greater than 100%. In most cases, imposing a fee above this threshold could require the consensus of the voters.

Determining the targeted level of cost recovery from a new or increased fee is not an analytical exercise. Instead, targets reflect agency-specific judgments linked to a variety of factors, such as existing City policies, agency-wide or departmental revenue objectives, economic goals, community values, market conditions, level of demand, and others.

A general means of selecting an appropriate cost recovery target is to consider the public and private benefits of the service or activity in question. To what degree does the public at large benefit from the service? To what degree does the individual or entity requesting, requiring, or causing the service benefit? When a service or activity completely benefits the public at large, it can be argued reasonably that there should be no cost recovery from fees (i.e., 0% cost recovery). A truly public-benefit service is best funded by the general resources of the City, such as General Fund revenues (e.g., taxes). Conversely, when a service or activity completely benefits an individual or entity, it can be argued reasonably that 100% of the cost should be recovered from fees collected from the individual or entity. An example of a completely private benefit service may be a request for exemption from a City regulation or process.

Under this approach, it is often found that many governmental services and activities fall somewhere between these two extremes, which is to say that most activities have a mixed benefit. In the majority of those cases, the initial cost recovery level targeted may attempt to reflect that mixed public and private benefit. For example, an activity that seems to have a 40% private benefit and a 60% public benefit would yield a cost recovery target from fees of 40%. An example of a mixed benefit service may be the review and approval of private work that would affect the public right-of-way; the City's involvement allows the private work to proceed while protecting the safety in and access to the area by the general public.

In some cases, a strict public-versus-private benefit judgment may not be sufficient to finalize a cost recovery target. Any of the following other factors and considerations may influence whether the cost of a service or activity is fully recovered or supplemented:

- If optimizing revenue potential is an overriding goal, is it feasible to recover the full cost of service?

- Will increasing fees result in non-compliance or public safety problems?
- Are there desired behaviors or modifications to behaviors of the service population that could be helped or hindered through the degree of pricing for the activities?
- Could fee increases adversely affect City goals, priorities, or values?

For specific subsets of City fees, even more specific questions may influence ultimate cost recovery targets:

- Does current demand for services support a fee increase without adverse impact to the citizenry served or current revenue levels? (In other words, would fee increases have the unintended consequence of driving away the population served?)
- Is there a good policy basis for differentiating between type of users (e.g., residents and non-residents, residential and commercial, non-profit entities and business entities)?
- Are there broader City objectives that inform a less than full cost recovery target from fees, such as economic development goals and local social values?

Because this element of the study is subjective, the consultant in charge of the analytical outcomes of this study has provided the full cost of service information and the framework for considering fees, while those closest to the fee-paying population – the City departments – have considered appropriate cost recovery levels at or below that full cost.

The initial outcomes of this Study will be presented to City Council in a Study Session for their review and comment. At the time actual fee amounts are proposed for adoption, the City's staff report will include a Master Fee Schedule document, which incorporates recommendations contained within this report as well as the review and input provided by City Council. The Master Fee Schedules may be referenced for recommended fee levels.

### Fee Establishment

Once the full cost of service was established and cost recovery targets were set, fees were calculated. The fully burdened rate was applied to an average labor time estimate to generate the average full cost of service. If less than full cost recovery was targeted, this figure was then adjusted downward to match the intended level of cost recovery from the fee. In nearly all cases, once these few steps were complete, the proposed fee was complete.

Because most of the City's fees are flat fees, they correspond directly to the average full cost of service result. For the few activities where estimating an average was impossible – due to the highly variable nature of the service – use of fully burdened hourly rates coupled with time-tracking was suggested as the fee structure. (In other words, the City would impose a fee per hour of staff time, requiring some degree of time estimation or outright time-tracking at the case level.)

Calculating fees during this study also included a range of other activities, described below:

- Addition to and deletion of fees imposed – The study process provided each department the opportunity to propose additions and deletions to their fee schedules, as well as rename, reorganize, and clarify fees imposed. Many such revisions were performed to better conform

fees to current practices, as well as improve the calculation of fees owed by an individual, the application of said fees, and the collection of revenues. In other words, as staff is more knowledgeable and comfortable working with the fee schedule, the accuracy achieved in both imposing fees on users and collecting revenues for the City is greater. Beyond this, some additions to the fee schedule were simply identification of existing services or activities performed by City staff for which no fee was imposed.

- Revision to the structure of fees – In most cases, the current structure of fees was sustained; the level of the fee was simply recalibrated to match the costs of service and targeted cost recovery level. In several cases, however, the manner in which a fee is imposed on a user was changed. In the majority of cases in which this was done, the primary objective was to simplify the fee structure, or increase the likelihood that the full cost of service would be recovered.
- Documentation of tools to calculate special cost recovery – An element included in the City's fee schedule was the fully burdened hourly rates by department. Documenting these rates in the fee schedule provides an opportunity for the City Council to approve rates that should be used whenever the City computes a special form of cost recovery under a "time and materials" approach. It also provides clear publication of those rates, so ultimate fee payers of any uniquely determined fee can reference the amounts. Publication of these rates in the master fee schedule is accompanied by language providing that special forms of cost recovery for activities and services not contemplated by the adopted master fee schedule can be computed at the discretion of the director of each department, following the rates adopted by the City Council in the master fee schedule.

The initial outcomes of this Study will be presented to City Council in a Study Session for their review and comment. At the time actual fee amounts are proposed for adoption, the City's staff report will include a Master Fee Schedule document, which incorporates recommendations contained within this report as well as the review and input provided by City Council. Proposed fees, if other than the full cost recovery amount established through this analysis, are shown in the proposed Master Fee Schedule for the City of Concord as part of the City's staff report.

### Comparative Fee Survey

Appendix B presents the results of the Comparative Fee Survey for the City of Concord. NBS worked with the City to choose five comparative agencies: Walnut Creek, Brentwood, Antioch, Pittsburg and Dublin.

Often policy makers request a comparison of their jurisdiction's fees to surrounding communities or similar scopes of operations. The purpose of a comparison is to provide a sense of the local market pricing for services, and to use that information to gauge the impact of recommendations for fee adjustments proposed by the consultant's report and staff recommendations.

Comparative fee surveys do not, however, provide information about the cost recovery policies or procedures inherent in each comparison agency. A "market based" decision to price services at below the cost of service analysis results shown for the City of Concord, is the same as making a decision to subsidize that service. Comparative agencies may or may not base their fee amounts on the estimated and reasonable cost of providing services.

This comparison to other agencies integrates Concord's restructured fee schedule, and adapts existing fee amounts to the new structure. The survey compares average current fee amounts to those of other

surveyed agencies to provide information on how the City currently compares, before action to increase or decrease fees for service are taken.

## Data Sources

The following City-published data sources were used to support the cost of service analysis and fee establishment phases of this study:

- The City of Concord's Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2014-15.
- A complete listing of all Fiscal Year 2014-15 City personnel, salary/wage rates, regular hours, paid benefits, and paid leave amounts – provided by the Finance Department.
- Various correspondences with the City staff supporting the adopted budgets and current fees, including budget notes and expenditure detail not shown in the published document.
- Prevailing fee schedules provided by each involved department.
- Annual volumetric (workload) data from the prior fiscal year provided by each involved department.

The City's adopted budget is the most significant source of information affecting cost of service results. It should be noted that consultant did not conduct separate efforts to audit or validate the City's financial management and budget practices, nor was cost information adjusted to reflect different levels of service or any specific, targeted performance benchmarks. This study has accepted the City's budget as a legislatively adopted directive describing the most appropriate and reasonable level of City spending. Consultants accept the City Council's deliberative process and ultimate acceptance of the budget plan and further assert that through that legislative process, the City has yielded a reasonable expenditure plan, valid for use in setting cost-based fees.

Beyond data published by the City, original data sets were also developed to support the work of this study: primarily, estimated staff time at various levels of detail. To develop these data sets, consultants prepared questionnaires and conducted meetings and interviews with individual departments. In the fee establishment phase of the analysis, departmental staff provided estimates of average time spent providing a service or activity corresponding with an existing or new fee. Consultants and departmental management reviewed and questioned responses to ensure the best possible set of estimates. The final sets of labor time estimates used in this study are reflected throughout the cost of service analysis included in the appendices to this report.

## Section 2 – CED Planning

The Planning Division serves the residents and businesses of the City of Concord by regulating the use of land based on the General Plan and the Zoning Regulations and Map, which contain the City's adopted policies and regulations.

### Cost of Service Analysis

The following table categorizes the estimated total costs of the Planning Division's fee related and non-fee related services, as well as the resulting fully-burdened hourly rate applicable toward establishing the "full" or "maximum" charge for fee related services.

Expenditure Type	Functional Activities / Cost Pools					Total
	Advanced Planning	Zoning Code Enforcement	Public Information / Counter	Current Planning Direct Fee Activity		
Labor	\$ 195,605	\$ 14,621	\$ 88,282	\$ 443,091	\$ 741,598	
Recurring Non-Labor	22,135	1,655	9,990	50,141	83,921	
Advanced Planning Contracted Services	150,000				150,000	
Department and Citywide Overhead	98,987	7,399	44,675	224,228	375,289	
Allocated Common Activities	116,867	8,735	52,745	264,733	443,081	
<b>Division Total</b>	<b>\$ 583,594</b>	<b>\$ 32,409</b>	<b>\$ 195,692</b>	<b>\$ 982,193</b>	<b>\$ 1,793,889</b>	
Eligible Cost Recovery from Fees for Service	0%	50%	50%	100%	61%	
Amount Eligible for Consideration in Billings/Fees	\$ -	\$ 16,205	\$ 97,846	\$ 982,193	\$ 1,096,244	
<b>Division Totals:</b>						
Amount Targeted for Recovery in Billings/Fees	\$ -	\$ 16,205	\$ 97,846	\$ 982,193	\$ 1,096,244	
Amount Requiring Another Funding Source	\$ 583,594	\$ 16,205	\$ 97,846	\$ -	\$ 697,645	
<b>Cost per Direct Hour Recoverable from Fees for Service</b>					<b>\$ 171</b>	
					<i>Reference: Direct Hours Only</i>	
					<b>6,394</b>	

The "Amount Targeted for Recovery in Billings/Fees" identifies all service areas that NBS supports as justifiable components of the fully-burdened hourly rate applied toward establishing user/regulatory fee recovery limits. The cost of service analysis and cost calculations at the individual fee level assume a fully-burdened hourly rate of \$171, with potential to recover approximately \$1.1 million in costs from fees for service.

The "Amount Requiring another Funding Source" identifies service areas that NBS recommends as best funded via alternate revenue sources other than user or regulatory fees. Significant analytical and policy decisions often revolve around inclusion of categorized activity costs in the fully-burdened hourly rate. The decision whether to include or exclude some or all of a particular cost category in user/regulatory fees for service is guided by basic fee setting parameters offered by the California State Constitution and Statutes, which requires that any new fee levied or existing fee increased should not exceed the estimated amount required to provide the service for which the charge is levied.

Cost category columns shown within the "Allocated or Direct Assignment of Cost to Functional Activities" section in the table above were created through information gathered in Division staff interviews. To assist the reader in understanding the underlying costs and assumptions used to calculate the fully-burdened hourly rate, summaries of the cost categories are provided as follows:

- Public Counter Duty / General Information – Activities associated with responding to phone calls and in support of active permits and the development review process in general. Typically, some portion of costs for provision of general public information and assistance are not linked for recovery from fees for planning applications. Planning staff estimates approximately 50% of these costs are supportive to land use and application submittal activities, while the remaining costs should be not be considered in the calculation of fees for services.
- Zoning Code Enforcement – Activities associated with enforcement of the current zoning code. Typically, some portion of costs for provision of zoning code enforcement and assistance are not linked for recovery from fees for planning applications. Planning staff estimates approximately 50% of these costs are supportive to zoning, land use and current planning application projects and activities, while the remaining costs should not be considered in the calculation of fees for services.
- Advance Planning Activity – Groups of tasks and activities devoted to the advance or long range planning efforts of the City, including the maintenance, update of the Citywide General Plan document and related studies. These costs are not recoverable in planning application fees for service, and require an alternate funding source, such as a General Plan Maintenance surcharge, discussed later in this report.
- Current Planning Direct Services: Work activities associated with an active current planning applications. 100% of these costs are recoverable in Planning user and regulatory fees for service.

The results of this Cost of Service Analysis conclude that the Planning Division is eligible to recover approximately 61% of the total annual cost of providing services from user/regulatory fees for service. Approximately 33% of costs may be considered for recovery as part of a General Plan Maintenance Surcharge (see Section 8). The remaining 6% of costs are not associated with fee-related activities and therefore require identification of alternate revenue sources.

### Cost Recovery Evaluation

The Planning Division currently recovers approximately 46% of the eligible costs of providing fee related services and 40% of Advanced Planning activity

Department / Division	Estimated Annual Current Fee Revenue	Eligible Cost Recovery from User / Regulatory Fee Revenue	Annual Cost Recovery Surplus / (Deficit)	Current Cost Recovery Percentage
CED Planning	\$ 506,600	\$ 1,096,244	\$ (589,644)	46%
CED Planning - General Plan Surcharge	\$ 233,438	\$ 583,594	\$ (350,156)	40%

Appendix A.1 presents the results of the detailed cost recovery analysis for fee recoverable services. The “Cost of Service per Activity Column” shown in the appendix table establishes the legal maximum at which a fee could be charged for the corresponding service identified in the “Fee Description” list. NBS worked extensively with department staff to gather estimates of time required to perform each service identified in the Appendix. Time estimates were independently evaluated on separate occasions by staff members and also analyzed by NBS to determine whether the time estimates provided seemed reasonable when compared against the numerous fee studies NBS staff have performed.

When the Cost of Service per Activity is compared to the Department’s “Current Fee”, some fees will appear to under recover their costs, some will come close to 100% recovery, and some will appear to collect more than the their cost of providing services. This is a typical outcome of any Cost of Service Analysis.

It should be noted that the results of the Cost Recovery Evaluation shown in Appendix A.1 do not include the costs of City departments or divisions external to the Planning Division that may routinely or periodically review planning submittals.

## **Proposed Fees**

It is common during the course of a user fee study for many fees for planning services to reflect a current subsidy level. The extent to the level of subsidy largely varies and is dependent on many factors; when the last cost analysis was performed, if the City has a current cost recovery policy in place to guide fee setting, the local economic environment, as well as the degree to which planning-related activities are viewed as generally beneficial to all taxpayers versus providing specific benefit to an individual or entity requiring planning services.

The consultant in charge of the analytical outcomes of this study has provided the full cost of service information and the framework for considering fees, while those closest to the fee-paying population – the City departments – have considered appropriate cost recovery levels at or below that full cost. Section 1 of this report may be referenced for cost recovery evaluation guidelines.

The initial outcomes of this Study will be presented to City Council in a Study Session for their review and comment. At the time actual fee amounts are proposed for adoption, the City's staff report will include a Master Fee Schedule document, which incorporates recommendations contained within this report as well as the review and input provided by City Council. The Master Fee Schedules may be referenced for recommended fee levels.

## Section 3 – CED Engineering

The Engineering Division reviews infrastructure improvements for private developments, processes encroachment permits, as well as develops and implements the City’s Capital Improvement Program.

### Cost of Service Analysis

The following table categorizes the estimated total costs of the Engineering Division’s fee related and non-fee related services, as well as the resulting fully-burdened hourly rate applicable toward establishing the “full” or “maximum” charge for fee related services:

Cost Element	Allocated or Direct Assignment of Cost to Functional Activity				
	Direct Services Plan Check	Direct Services Inspection	Processing	Non-Fee	Total
Labor	\$ 98,657	\$ 298,059	\$ 66,437	\$ 371,745	\$ 834,898
Recurring Non-Labor	\$ 10,809	\$ 32,657	\$ 7,279	\$ 58,540	\$ 109,285
Allocated Common Activities	\$ 131,097	\$ 131,783	\$ 22,069	\$ 104,623	\$ 389,571
GF Engineering Citywide Overhead	\$ 51,330	\$ 155,077	\$ 34,567	\$ 163,873	\$ 404,848
<b>Total - Labor, Non-Labor, and Overhead</b>	<b>\$ 291,893</b>	<b>\$ 617,575</b>	<b>\$ 130,352</b>	<b>\$ 698,780</b>	<b>\$ 1,738,601</b>
Eligible Cost Recovery from Fees for Service	100%	100%	100%	0%	60%
Amount Eligible for Consideration in Billings/Fees	\$ 291,893	\$ 617,575	\$ 130,352	\$ -	\$ 1,039,821
<b>Division Totals:</b>					
Amount Targeted for Recovery in Billings/Fees	\$ 291,893	\$ 617,575	\$ 130,352	\$ -	\$ 1,039,821
Amount Requiring Another Funding Source	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 698,780	\$ 698,780
<b>Cost per Direct Hour Recoverable from Fees for Service</b>	<b>\$ 238</b>	<b>\$ 151</b>	<b>\$ 132</b>		
Reference Direct Hours	1,225	4,085	986		

The “Amount Targeted for Recovery in Billings / Fees” area of the table identifies all service areas that NBS supports as justifiable components of the fully-burdened hourly rate applied toward establishing user/regulatory fee recovery limits. The cost of service analysis and cost calculations at the individual fee level assume a fully-burdened hourly rate of \$238 for Plan Check, \$151 for Inspection and \$132 for Processing, with potential to recover approximately \$1 million in costs from fees for service.

The “Amount Requiring another Funding Source” area identifies service areas that NBS recommends as best funded via alternate revenue sources than user or regulatory fees. Significant analytical and policy decisions often revolve around inclusion of categorized activity costs in the fully-burdened hourly rate. The decision whether to include or exclude some or all of a particular cost category in user/regulatory fees for service is guided by basic fee setting parameters offered by the California State Constitution and Statutes, which requires that any new fee levied or existing fee increased should not exceed the estimated amount required to provide the service for which the charge is levied.

Cost category columns shown within the “Allocated or Direct Assignment of Cost to Functional Activities” section in the table above were created through information gathered in Division staff interviews. To assist the reader in understanding the underlying costs and assumptions used to calculate the fully-burdened hourly rate, summaries of the cost categories are provided as follows:

- Non-Fee related activity includes – Tasks related to managing and implementing City capital improvement projects and special City projects. 100% of the non-fee related engineering costs should be funded through revenues available or designated to complete each project, not from current development related fee revenue.

- Direct Plan Check, Inspection and Processing Services: Work activities associated with active current engineering applications and permits. 100% of these costs are recoverable in Engineering user and regulatory fees for service.

The results of this Cost of Service Analysis conclude that the Engineering Division is eligible to recover approximately 60% of the total annual cost of providing all services from user/regulatory fees for services that have been budgeted in the general fund. The remaining 40% of costs are not associated with fee-related activities and therefore require identification of alternate revenue sources.

### Cost Recovery Evaluation

The Engineering Division currently recovers approximately 100% of the eligible costs of providing fee related services.

Department / Division	Estimated Annual Current Fee Revenue	Eligible Cost Recovery from User / Regulatory Fee Revenue	Annual Cost Recovery Surplus / (Deficit)	Current Cost Recovery Percentage
CED Engineering	1,044,000	1,039,821	4,179	100%

Appendix A.1 presents the results of the detailed cost recovery analysis for fee recoverable services. The Engineering Division fee services are displayed in the CED Cost of Service listing combined with Planning and Building. The “Cost of Service per Activity Column” shown in the appendix table establishes the legal maximum at which a fee could be charged for the corresponding service identified in the “Fee Description” list. NBS worked extensively with Department staff to gather estimates of time required to perform each service identified in the Appendix. Time estimates were independently evaluated on separate occasions by staff members and also analyzed by NBS to determine whether the time estimates provided seemed reasonable when compared against the numerous fee studies NBS staff have performed.

When the Cost of Service per Activity is compared to the Department’s “Current Fee”, some fees will appear to under recover their costs, some will come close to 100% recovery, and some will appear to collect more than their cost of providing services. This is a typical outcome of any Cost of Service Analysis.

### Proposed Fees

Pricing services either equal to, or below the maximum full cost recovery amount established through a fee study will largely depend on the local economic environment, as well as the degree to which City engineering services are viewed as generally beneficial to all taxpayers versus providing specific benefit to an individual or entity requesting services. Section 1 of this report may be referenced for cost recovery evaluation guidelines.

The consultant in charge of the analytical outcomes of this study has provided the full cost of service information and the framework for considering fees, while those closest to the fee-paying population – the City departments – have considered appropriate cost recovery levels at or below that full cost. Section 1 of this report may be referenced for cost recovery evaluation guidelines.

The initial outcomes of this Study will be presented to City Council in a Study Session for their review and comment. At the time actual fee amounts are proposed for adoption, the City’s staff report will include a Master Fee Schedule document, which incorporates recommendations contained within this report as well as the review and input provided by City Council. The Master Fee Schedules may be referenced for recommended fee levels.

## Section 4 –CED Building Fees

The Building Department’s primary purpose is to ensure that all construction related activity within the City adheres to state and local laws for building, electrical, mechanical and plumbing codes. The Building & Safety Division performs plan review services, issues permits and conducts field inspections of construction work for compliance with those codes, among others. The Division issues permits for construction or remodeling related to residential, multi-family and commercial construction. Building Inspections are conducted during construction activities for builders and consumers to ensure that the built environment meets these established health and safety standards.

The City currently calculates most building permit and plan check fees based on the most historically common approach to fee calculation. For most new construction, tenant improvement, addition, and remodel projects, a project valuation multiplier is utilized to establish a construction value estimate for a given building project. The established construction value is assessed a fee amount based on a sliding scale fee table, first established by the Uniform Building Code more than 50 years ago. Mechanical, Plumbing and Electrical permits are assessed a fee amount based on an itemized list of permits required, such as for a water heater, gas line, or electrical service upgrade.

The Division applied the fully-burdened hourly rate calculated by NBS for certain areas of the interim update process, mostly for the various New Construction, Mechanical, Plumbing, and Electrical and Other Specific permits. The following provides a summary of the hourly rate calculation for consideration.

The table below categorizes the Building Division’s costs across both fee related and non-fee related services, as well as the resulting fully-burdened hourly rate applicable toward establishing the “full” or “maximum” charge for fee related services.

Cost Element	Direct Services - Processing	Direct Services Plan Review	Direct Services Inspection	Building Code Enforcement	Public Information / Counter	Total
Labor	\$ 235,068	\$ 242,154	\$ 565,928	\$ 188,722	\$ 146,844	\$ 1,378,717
Recurring Non-Labor	\$ 30,325	\$ 31,240	\$ 73,009	\$ 24,346	\$ 18,944	\$ 177,864
Allocated Common Activities	\$ 26,230	\$ 27,020	\$ 63,148	\$ 21,058	\$ 16,385	\$ 153,842
1008600 Building Dept. and Citywide Overhead	\$ 123,992	\$ 127,730	\$ 298,513	\$ 99,546	\$ 77,457	\$ 727,238
1008710 MF Housing Inspection Dept. and Citywide Overhead	\$ 3,220	\$ 3,317	\$ 7,753	\$ 2,585	\$ 2,012	\$ 18,888
<b>Total - Labor, Non-Labor, and Overhead</b>	<b>\$ 418,836</b>	<b>\$ 431,462</b>	<b>\$ 1,008,351</b>	<b>\$ 336,258</b>	<b>\$ 261,642</b>	<b>\$ 2,456,549</b>
Eligible Cost Recovery from Fees for Service	100%	100%	100%	50%	50%	88%
<b>Division Totals:</b>						
Amount Targeted for Recovery in Billings/Fees	\$ 418,836	\$ 431,462	\$ 1,008,351	\$ 168,129	\$ 130,821	\$ 2,157,599
Amount Requiring Another Funding Source	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 168,129	\$ 130,821	\$ 298,950
<b>Cost per Direct Hour Recoverable from Fees for Service</b>	<b>\$ 85</b>	<b>\$ 139</b>	<b>\$ 122</b>			
Reference Direct Hours	4,918	4,047	9,672			

The “Amount Targeted for Consideration in Billings/Fees” row of this table identifies all service areas that NBS supports as justifiable components of the fully-burdened hourly rate applied toward establishing user/regulatory fee recovery limits. The cost of service analysis and cost calculations at the individual fee level assumes a fully-burdened hourly rate of \$ 139 for Plan Review, \$122 for Inspection and \$85 for Processing, with a target to recover approximately \$2.1 million in costs from fees for service.

The “Amount Requiring another Funding Source” row of this table identifies service areas that NBS recommends as best funded via alternate revenue sources than fees for service. Significant analytical and policy decisions often revolve around inclusion of categorized activity costs in the fully-burdened hourly rate. The decision whether to include or exclude some or all of a particular cost category in user/regulatory fees for service is guided by basic fee setting parameters offered by the California State Constitution and

Statutes, which requires that any new fee levied or existing fee increased should not exceed the estimated amount required to provide the service for which the charge is levied.

Cost category nomenclature shown in the table above was adapted and summarized from division staff interviews. To assist the reader in understanding the underlying costs and assumptions used to calculate the fully-burdened hourly rate, summaries of the cost categories are provided as follows:

- **General Information / Public Counter** – Staff time devoted to responding to phone calls and public inquiries not specifically associated with an active permit. Typically, some portion of costs for provision of general public information and assistance are not linked for recovery from fees for building plan review and inspection. Building staff estimates approximately 50% is associated with plan submittal and project inspection activities, while the remaining costs should not be considered in the calculation of fees for services.
- **Building Code Enforcement** – Activities associated with enforcement of the building code. Typically, some portion of costs for provision of building code enforcement and assistance are not linked for recovery from fees for building permit services. Building staff estimates approximately 50% of these costs are supportive to building and current development activities, while the remaining costs should be not be considered in the calculation of fees for services.
- **Permit Processing, Plan Check, and Inspection Activities** - Work activities associated with active building permit applications. 100% of these costs are recoverable in user and regulatory fees for service.

The results of this Cost of Service Analysis conclude that the Building Department is eligible to recover approximately 88% of its annual costs of providing services from user/regulatory fees for service, while approximately 12% of its annual costs are not associated with fee-related activities and therefore require identification of alternate revenue sources.

## Section 5 – Police Fees

The scope of this user and regulatory fee analysis for Police focused solely on various administrative processing fees, business regulatory permits fees, alarm permitting and vehicle release fee services.

### Cost of Service Analysis

The majority of services provided by the Police Department are not recoverable in user/regulatory fees for service. For the Police Department, fees were calculated following fully-burdened labor rates that were derived for several specific categories of personnel. This was performed uniquely for this Department, in order to conform to the manner in which it examines and understands its own provision of services and activities. It is simply an alternate methodology that allowed the Department to better participate in the Fee Establishment phase of the analysis.

The table below illustrates the fully-burdened hourly rate for labor performed by personnel in the Police Department:

Expenditure Type	Direct Services & Activities-Non-Sworn	Direct Services & Activities-Sworn	Total
Labor Costs	\$ 4,231,497	\$ 27,196,079	\$ 31,427,576
Non-Labor Costs	666,783	780,528	1,447,311
Department and Citywide Overhead	1,320,697	7,543,181	8,863,878
Divisional Overhead	2,121,734	12,118,318	14,240,052
<b>Department Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,340,711</b>	<b>\$ 47,638,106</b>	<b>\$ 55,978,817</b>
<i>Fully Burdened Hourly Rate</i>	<i>\$ 122</i>	<i>\$ 202</i>	
<i>Rate Basis: Productive Hours</i>	<i>68,198</i>	<i>235,498</i>	

The cost of service analysis and cost calculations at the individual fee level assume a fully-burdened hourly rate as shown above, as applicable.

### Cost Recovery Evaluation

The Police Department currently recovers approximately 125% of the eligible costs of providing fee related services.

Department / Division	Estimated Annual Current Fee Revenue	Eligible Cost Recovery from User / Regulatory Fee Revenue	Annual Cost Recovery Surplus / (Deficit)	Current Cost Recovery Percentage
Police	124,252	99,397	24,855	125%

At current demand for fee related services, the Police Department collects approximately \$124,252 per year in revenue. At the full cost recovery fee amount calculated by NBS for each fee for service, the same demand for services would generate approximately \$99,397.

Appendix A.3 presents the results of the detailed cost recovery analysis for the Police Department's fee recoverable services. The "Cost of Service per Activity Column" establishes the legal maximum at which a fee could be charged for the corresponding service identified in the "Fee Description" list. NBS worked

extensively with Department staff to gather estimates of time required to perform each service identified in the Appendix. Time estimates were independently evaluated on separate occasions by staff members and also analyzed by NBS to determine whether the time estimates provided seemed reasonable when compared against the numerous fee studies NBS staff have performed.

When the Cost of Service per Activity is compared to the Department's Current Fee, some fees will appear to under recover their costs, some will come close to 100% recovery, and some will appear to collect more than their cost of providing services. This is a typical outcome of any Cost of Service Analysis.

## **Proposed Fees**

It is common for Police user and regulatory fees services to vary greatly depending if the City has performed a cost analysis recently or ever, as traditionally, some of these special regulatory business permits have not been structured with cost recovery in mind.

The consultant in charge of the analytical outcomes of this study has provided the full cost of service information and the framework for considering fees, while those closest to the fee-paying population – the City departments – have considered appropriate cost recovery levels at or below that full cost. Section 1 of this report may be referenced for cost recovery evaluation guidelines. Pricing for these services will largely depend on the local economic environment, as well as the degree to which these fee related activities are viewed as generally beneficial to all taxpayers versus providing specific benefit to an individual or entity requesting services.

The initial outcomes of this Study will be presented to City Council in a Study Session for their review and comment. At the time actual fee amounts are proposed for adoption, the City's staff report will include a Master Fee Schedule document, which incorporates recommendations contained within this report as well as the review and input provided by City Council. The Master Fee Schedules may be referenced for recommended fee levels.

At the recommended fee amounts proposed, the Police would collect approximately 100% of the maximum cost of service amount established through this Study, adjusting the estimated annual revenue collection from current levels by approximately (\$25,000).

## Section 6 – Admin Fees

The Administrative Fee section of the City's Master Fee Schedule contains fees performed by Finance and Administrative Services.

### Cost of Service Analysis

The cost analysis permed for the Administrative section of the fee schedule was performed at the unit fee level, as the City does not currently track the number of fee related services. The fee for service activity level is generally very low, as the primary role and responsibility for these two departments is to provide internal support services for other departments in the City and not fee related services. The following table summarizes the fee related services included in the study. The final results have been included in Appendices A.4, along with the recommended results. Below is a list of fees included in the Admin fee section included in the cost analysis.

ADMINISTRATIVE FEES	
<b>1</b>	<b>Citywide Appeals (Non-CED):</b>
1.1	Appeal requiring public notice (CMC 2-52)
1.2	Appeal where no public notice is required (CMC 2-53)
<b>2</b>	<b>Copies of Public Records/Information</b>
2.1	Per page (per case law)
2.2	Miscellaneous (includes micro film)
<b>3</b>	<b>Electronic Data Request (CD/DVD Copy)</b>
3.1	Copy of Existing Data File
3.2	Copy of Non-Existing Data File
<b>4</b>	<b>Extract of document and certification (each page)</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Certifying documents, Live Certificates (each document)</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Subpoena Fee</b>
6.1	Response to subpoena - Hourly
6.2	Response to subpoena - Records
6.3	Response to subpoena - Civil
BUSINESS, PROFESSIONS AND TRADES FEES	
<b>7</b>	<b>Administrative Processing Fee for Business Licenses or Permits</b>
7.1	Administrative processing fee issue of new license or permits
7.2	Administrative processing fee renewal of license or permits
7.3	Business License Exemption Audit Fee

### Cost Recovery Evaluation

The Administrative section currently recovers on average approximately 61% of the eligible costs of providing fee related services.

Department / Division		Current Cost Recovery Percentage
Admin	[1]	61%
[1] Volume of activity data not available; average percent of recovery used for comparison purposes		

Appendix A.4 presents the results of the detailed cost recovery analysis for fee recoverable services. The “Cost of Service per Activity Column” shown in the appendix table establishes the legal maximum at which a fee could be charged for the corresponding service identified in the “Fee Description” list. NBS worked extensively with Department staff to gather estimates of time required to perform each service identified in the Appendix. Time estimates were independently evaluated on separate occasions by staff members and also analyzed by NBS to determine whether the time estimates provided seemed reasonable when compared against the numerous fee studies NBS staff have performed.

When the Cost of Service per Activity is compared to the Department’s “Current Fee”, some fees will appear to under recover their costs, some will come close to 100% recovery, and some will appear to collect more than their cost of providing services. This is a typical outcome of any Cost of Service Analysis.

## **Proposed Fees**

Pricing services either equal to, or below the maximum full cost recovery amount established through a fee study will largely depend on the local economic environment, as well as the degree to which City engineering services are viewed as generally beneficial to all taxpayers versus providing specific benefit to an individual or entity requesting services. Section 1 of this report may be referenced for cost recovery evaluation guidelines.

The consultant in charge of the analytical outcomes of this study has provided the full cost of service information and the framework for considering fees, while those closest to the fee-paying population – the City departments – have considered appropriate cost recovery levels at or below that full cost. Section 1 of this report may be referenced for cost recovery evaluation guidelines.

The initial outcomes of this Study will be presented to City Council in a Study Session for their review and comment. At the time actual fee amounts are proposed for adoption, the City’s staff report will include a Master Fee Schedule document, which incorporates recommendations contained within this report as well as the review and input provided by City Council. The Master Fee Schedules may be referenced for recommended fee levels.

## Section 7 – Parks and Recreation Fees

Recreation fee services included in this study are provided by personnel in the Parks and Recreation Department. The Department offers a wide variety of recreation services and programs serving Concord City's youth, seniors and adults. Specific current program and class offerings can be found in the City's periodic activities guide. Unlike other areas of the study, this Department's analysis has been conducted at the program level (as opposed to the individual fee level) and includes a cost recovery evaluation of the following programs:

<b>PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES</b>	
<b>CAMP CONCORD</b>	
	Camp Concord - Direct Program Support (100-4200)
<b>RECREATION SERVICES</b>	
	Facilities Operations and Programs (1000-4210)
	Willow Pass (4211)
	Centre Concord (4212)
	Aquatics (4213)
	Rec Classes (4214)
	Teen (4215)
	Youth (4216)
	Preschool (4217)
<b>SPORTS AND EVENTS</b>	
	Sports and Events (100-4220)
<b>SENIOR AND SPECIAL RECREATION PROGRAMS</b>	
	Senior and Special Recreation Programs (100-4240)
<b>DIABLO CREEK GOLF COURSE</b>	
	Diablo Creek Golf Course (Fund 700)

The expenses of administering, operating, and maintaining the City's parks and recreation programs and facilities are primarily funded by resources from the General Fund. However, fees collected from various Recreation programs, including classes, contracts, and specific uses of public spaces can represent a significant source of funding to help cover costs and sustain – if not improve – the level of service provided by the City.

## Impacts of Proposition 26 on Recreation Fee Analysis

NBS has changed its approach to Recreation Fee analysis since Proposition 26 passed. Based on the *League of California Cities Implementation Guide, April 2011*, (LCC IG) and subsequent interpretations written by City Attorney Michael Colantuono in December 2011, NBS now performs a high level cost analysis by program area to assist local communities develop a cost recovery policy, rather than an analysis at the individual fee level. Additionally, NBS provides the following guidance to for cities related to Recreation Fees.

The LCC IG guidance identifies language that a charge for a lesson, class, program and other participation is not “imposed” within the meaning of Proposition 26 if:

- a) Participants have meaningful private market options, and
- b) Participation is meaningfully voluntary.

The LCC IG further identifies guidelines for “Fees for Services that are not imposed” not only on the nature of the service, but also on such factors as:

- a) Whether the charge is in connection with a service the provision of which is a statutory purpose of the local agency;
- b) Whether the charge is in connection with a service for which the local agency is the exclusive provider within its service territory or otherwise exercises a monopoly pricing power;
- c) Whether the charge is in connection with a service, product, or opportunity the local government provides in competition with others, particularly private enterprise; or
- d) Whether the charge is established by arm’s length voluntary contract negotiations.

Where a private market co-exists with the provision of the same services by local government, it is arguable that charges for the services provided by local government are not “imposed”. Although these charges may be established by the local governing body, the services are not provided pursuant to a statutory obligation. In these circumstances, if they are provided in competition with the same or similar services provided by others, and if the recipients of the service have a choice to receive the service or not, then the rate-payers are protected from the excessive rates by market forces, or their own power to meet their needs in other ways.

While we have included in the scope of service, a fee survey of comparable jurisdictions, per Prop 26, NBS has added an additional component. We also recommend that a local government document the market options available to consumers. We include this information in the final report, demonstrating that participation in the government’s program is meaningfully voluntary and that a private market co-exists, to support the determination that charges for recreational, cultural and educational programs are not subject to Proposition 26.

It is important for NBS to determine if there are any programs that the City offers that do not meet this criteria of having “meaningful private market options”. If participation is not meaningfully voluntary, then these programs or services will be included in the cost analysis per Proposition 26. NBS confirmed that the City does not currently have any programs that either do not have “meaningful private options”, or are indeed “imposed”. An example of an “imposed” fee would be for a class requiring participation to obtain a “taxi permit” or the like. This type of fee would need to be included in the cost analysis.

## Cost of Service Analysis

NBS evaluated each Recreation program’s annual cost recovery level by matching the most recent fiscal year of revenues collected, to the total program costs established through this study. The table below summarizes results of that analysis:

CITY OF CONCORD  
PARKS AND RECREATION  
Cost Estimation for Providing Fee Related Activities and Services

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis			Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
Description		Cost of Service Activity	Current Fee Revenue	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage		
<b>PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES</b>		\$ 7,354,089	\$ 4,117,223	56%	\$ 4,117,223	56%
<b>CAMP CONCORD</b>		\$ 961,361 [3]	\$ 261,820	27%	\$ 261,820	27%
Camp Concord - Direct Program Support (100-4200)						
<b>RECREATION SERVICES</b>		\$ 3,062,533 [3]	\$ 1,764,498	58%	\$ 1,764,498	58%
Facilities Operations and Programs (1000-4210)		\$ -	\$ 236,641			
Willow Pass (4211)	[2]	\$ 461,314	\$ 91,000	20%	\$ 91,000	20%
Centre Concord (4212)	[2]	\$ 784,316	\$ 280,000	36%	\$ 280,000	36%
Aquatics (4213)	[2]	\$ 824,004				
Rec Classes (4214)	[2]	\$ 453,593				
Teen (4215)	[2]	\$ 84,912	\$ 40,000	62%	\$ 40,000	62%
Youth (4216)	[2]	\$ 139,634	\$ 100,000	91%	\$ 100,000	91%
Preschool (4217)	[2]	\$ 314,760	\$ 385,000	155%	\$ 385,000	155%
<b>SPORTS AND EVENTS</b>		\$ 599,406 [3]	\$ 395,100	66%	\$ 395,100	66%
Sports and Events (100-4220)						
<b>SENIOR AND SPECIAL RECREATION PROGRAMS</b>		\$ 1,348,621 [3]	\$ 260,200	19%	\$ 260,200	19%
Senior and Special Recreation Programs (100-4240)						
<b>DIABLO CREEK GOLF COURSE</b>		\$ 1,382,169 [3]	\$ 1,435,605	104%	\$ 1,435,605	104%
Diablo Creek Golf Course (Fund 700)						
<b>TOTAL PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES</b>						
Notes						
[2] Sourced from FY 14/15 Budget Expenses						

Section 1, Methods of Analysis, provides further definition and discussion of the elements of the total program cost calculation for each Department.

### Cost Recovery Evaluation

NBS evaluated each Recreation program’s estimated annual cost recovery level by matching the most recent fiscal year of revenues collected, to the total program costs established through this study. Overall, Recreation programs recover approximately 56% of the citywide costs of providing services. The following table summarizes results of that analysis:

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis		
Description		Cost of Service Activity	Current Fee Revenue	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES</b>		\$ 7,354,089	\$ 4,117,223	56%

Due to the unique nature of Recreation services, the study performed by NBS provides an annual cost and revenue analysis at the program level. This provides City staff and City Council with current cost recovery data and allows the City to establish a cost recovery policy per program.

In the table above (Cost of Services Analysis section), existing revenue for each area of service is shown next to the “Total Program Costs”. In most cases, the results of this analysis will show that current revenue amounts recover less than the cost of service calculated by NBS.

### **Fee Establishment**

In considering cost recovery targets and recommended fees, the Department provided recommendations to be set at the current recovery rate across its fee categories. NBS also notes that under Proposition 26, the fees for use of government property are not subject to the cost of service limitations of other user and regulatory fee activities. In all cases, the Department sought to sustain current fee levels.

NBS provided the full cost of service information and the framework for considering fees, while those closest to the fee-paying population – the City departments/divisions – considered appropriate cost recovery levels at or below that full cost amount for Recreation and Community Service fees, or at market rates for facility rentals, pre-school program and golf fees.

## Section 8 – General Plan Maintenance Surcharge

It is common for jurisdictions in California to employ “surcharges” on top of their fees for service to fund certain types of operational support costs. Common surcharges charged by California public agencies on top of development permits include those for update and maintenance of the general plan documents. Surcharges are generally assessed as a percentage of fees or some other metric such as project construction value.

### General Plan Maintenance and Update Surcharge

The City of Concord updates its General Plan on a routine basis. This Plan helps to guide the growth of the community in a consistent manner. Government Code 66014 (b) allows local agencies to, “...include the costs reasonably necessary to prepare and revise the plans and policies that a local agency is required to adopt before it can make any necessary findings and determinations”. This section of the Government Code supports the development of a fee to recover a reasonable share of costs associated with the update and maintenance of the General Plan.

Most cities perform a comprehensive update of their General Plan on a five to ten year cycle. As shown in the table below, on a 10 year update cycle, the Community Development Department would need to accrue approximately \$583,594 per year in costs, for the purpose of updating and maintaining their Plan. Details of assumptions behind this annual cost figure were provided by City staff, and are presented in the table below. The City is currently recovering 40% of the costs at the current rate of 0.25% of permit valuation.

Cost Category	Total Annualized Cost	100% Recovery	75% Recovery	50% Recovery	Current Fee - 40% Recovery
Contracted Services (\$1,500,000 over 10 years)	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 112,500	\$ 75,000	\$ 60,000
Staff Time (Average Per Year)	\$ 433,594	\$ 433,594	\$ 325,195	\$ 216,797	\$ 173,438
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 583,594</b>	<b>\$ 583,594</b>	<b>\$ 437,695</b>	<b>\$ 291,797</b>	<b>\$ 233,438</b>
Building Valuation of New Construction or Additions (FY 09/10)		\$94,369,169	\$ 94,369,169	\$ 94,369,169	\$ 94,369,169
<b>General Plan Maintenance Surcharge</b>		<b>0.62%</b>	<b>0.46%</b>	<b>0.31%</b>	<b>0.25%</b>

To implement a surcharge for recovery of general plan maintenance and update costs, the Department and Council could agree upon a desired cost recovery target for this program, to be captured on top of Building permit fees related to new construction and additions projects. The following are a couple of policy options typically seen in other jurisdictions:

- **Policy Option 1:** Recover 100% of the annual costs via building permit fee surcharge.
- **Policy Option 2:** Recover less than 100% of the annual costs via building permit fee surcharge.

The remaining unfunded amount would be subsidized by other City revenue sources such as the general fund for the general community benefit received from the plan, as well as for the use of the Plan by other departments.

The following table presents four options for surcharge amounts based on 100%, as well as stages of less than 100% recovery of General Plan costs on top of building permit fees. The City recommends a 50% recovery target for a fee of 0.31% of permit valuation.

In adopting a General Plan maintenance and update surcharge, each jurisdiction’s policy makers must decide to what degree new development impacts the revision and maintenance efforts to their Plan. For jurisdictions with large amounts of undeveloped land available, the impact is typically considered higher

than for jurisdictions that are closer to “build-out” of available land resources. All funds collected from a surcharge should be designated to a separate fund for their intended use.

## Section 9 – Conclusion

Based on the Cost of Service Analysis, Cost Recovery Evaluation, and Fee Establishment phases of analysis in this study, the proposed master schedule of fees formatted for implementation has been prepared and included in the City's accompanying staff report (*prepared at the time that fees are taken to the City Council, based on fee recommendations*).

As discussed throughout this report, the proposed fee schedule includes fee increases intended to greatly improve the City's recovery of costs incurred to provide individual services, as well as to adjust fees downward where fees charge exceed the average costs incurred.

Predicting the amount to which any adopted fee increases will affect Department revenues is difficult to quantify. For the near-term, the City should not count on increased revenues to meet any specific expenditure plan. Experience with these fee increases should be gained first before revenue projections are revised. However, unless there is some significant, long-term change in activity levels at the City, proposed fee amendments should – over time – enhance the City's revenue capabilities, providing it the ability to stretch other resources further for the benefit of the public at large.

The City's Master Fee Schedule should become a living document but handled with care:

- A fundamental purpose of the fee schedule is to provide clarity and transparency to the public and to staff regarding fees imposed by the City. Once adopted by the Council, the fee schedule is the final word on the amount and manner in which fees should be imposed by the departments. Old fee schedules should be superseded by the new master document. If the master document is found to be missing fees, those fees need eventually to be added to the master schedule and should not continue to exist outside the consolidated, master framework.
- The City should consider adjusting these user fees and regulatory fees on an annual basis to keep pace at least with cost inflation. For all fees and charges, the City could use either a Consumer Price Index adjustment or a percentage of Labor Cost increase, and that practice would be well applied to the new fee schedule. Conducting a comprehensive user fee study is not an annual requirement; it becomes worthwhile only over time as significant shifts in organization, local practices, legislative values, or legal requirements change. In NBS' experience, a comprehensive analysis such as this should be performed every three to five years. It should be noted that when an automatic adjustment is applied annually, the City is free to use its discretion in applying the adjustment; not all fees need to be adjusted, especially when there are good policy reasons for an alternate course. Those fees governed by Prop 218, the full cost of service is the City's only limit in setting its fees. Conversely, fees governed by Prop 26, the market will dictate the fee level.

As a final note in this study, it is worth acknowledging the path that fees in general have taken in California. The public demands ever more precise and equitable accounting of the basis for governmental fees and a greater say in when and how they are imposed. It is inevitable in the not too distant future that user fees and regulatory fees will demand an even greater level of analysis and supporting data to meet the public's evolving expectations. Technology systems will play an increased and significant role in an agency's ability to accomplish this. Continuous improvement and refinement of time tracking abilities will greatly enhance the City's ability to set fees for service and identify unfunded activities in years to come.

In preparing this report and the opinions and recommendations included herein, NBS has relied on a number of principal assumptions and considerations with regard to financial matters, conditions and events that may occur in the future. This information and assumptions, including the City's budgets, time estimate data, and workload information from City staff, were provided by sources we believe to be reliable; however, NBS has not independently verified such information and assumptions.

While we believe NBS' use of such information and assumptions is reasonable for the purpose of this report, some assumptions will invariably not materialize as stated herein and may vary significantly due to unanticipated events and circumstances. Therefore, the actual results can be expected to vary from those projected to the extent that actual future conditions differ from those assumed by NBS or provided to NBS by others.

## **APPENDIX A – COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS**

---

**APPENDIX A.1 - CED – Planning, Engineering and Building**

**APPENDIX A.1 - CED – Engineering (included in A.1)**

**APPENDIX A.2 - CED –Building**

**APPENDIX A.3 - Police**

**APPENDIX A.4 - Administrative Fees**

**APPENDIX A.5 - Parks and Recreation**



Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis			
No.	Description		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity	Combined Total Cost
7.3.3	Review (single lot, part of subdivision)	[9]	1.00		1.00			\$ 171	\$ 238		\$ 410
7.4	Other Plan Review as Required	[9]	1.00		1.00			\$ 171	\$ 238		\$ 410
	<b>Building Permit Inspection Fees</b>										
	NOTE: Includes required inspections for all construction codes adopted by the City.										
7.4.1	Valuation-based Inspection Fees										See Building Cost Analysis
7.4.2	Valuation-based Inspection - Plumbing/Electrical/Mechanical (PEM) only										See Building Cost Analysis
7.4.3	Additional Inspections	[9]					1.00			\$ 122	\$ 122
7.5	Plot Plan (Final Grading and Drainage Improvements) Inspection (single lot, part of a subdivision)	[9]				1.00		\$ -	\$ 151		\$ 151
7.6	Building Permit Stormwater Pollution Prevention Compliance (Please refer to [Section 39] for related fees.)										
7.6.1	Coordination (per 1/2 hour, 1/2 hour minimum)	[9]			0.50			\$ -	\$ 119		\$ 119
7.6.2	Additional time above minimum (per hour)	[9]			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238		\$ 238
7.6.3	C.3 service fee for permits increasing impervious surface	[3]									
8	<b>Child Care Program (CMC 78-63) * (Placeholder for MFS; not included in cost analysis)</b>										
8.1	Non-restricted project fee due upon issuance of Certificate of Occupancy (% of value)	[3]									
8.2	Residential Projects	[3]									
9	<b>Condition Compliance and Mitigation Monitoring</b>										
9.1	Minor (Admin with no DRB)		2.00		2.00		1.00	\$ 343	\$ 476	\$ 139	\$ 958
9.2	Major (with DRB)	[9]	20.00		30.00		1.00	\$ 3,429	\$ 7,146	\$ 139	\$ 10,714
9.3	Stormwater Facility Certification	[2,9]			4.00	2.00	1.00	\$ -	\$ 1,255	\$ 139	\$ 1,394
9.4	Specialized Condition Compliance - conducted by consultant	[2,10]						actual cost	actual cost	actual cost	actual cost
10	<b>Design and Site Review</b>										
10.1	Design and Site Review										
10.1.1	Minor (Admin with no DRB)	[9]	8.00		4.00		2.00	\$ 1,372	\$ 953	\$ 278	\$ 2,602
10.1.2	Major (with DRB)	[9]	40.00		20.00		4.00	\$ 6,858	\$ 4,764	\$ 556	\$ 12,178
10.2	Sign Design Review		3.00				0.50	\$ 514	\$ -	\$ 70	\$ 584
10.3	Design and Site Review Extension		3.00					\$ 514	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 514
10.4	Sign - Administrative Design Review										
	Staff extension		1.00					\$ 171	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 171
	Board approval extension		2.00					\$ 343	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 343
11	<b>Development Agreement</b>										
	Development Agreement	[9]	40.00		10.00			\$ 6,858	\$ 2,382	\$ -	\$ 9,240
12	<b>Development Project Mitigation Fee for Fire Station No. 22</b>										
12.1	Mitigation fee	[3]									
12.2	Plus Administrative fee	[3]									
13	<b>Documents, Maps, Imaging and Technology</b>										
13.1	Documents	[10]									
13.1.1	Per page (per case law)	[14]									



Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity	
No.	Description
16.3	<b>Curb / gutter / sidewalk, not in addition to major construction. (30 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>
16.3.1	Plan Review (if Required)
16.3.2	Inspection fee up to 400 square feet
16.3.3	Each add'l 200 sq ft or fraction thereof
16.3.4	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.
16.4	<b>Driveway (30 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>
16.4.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.4.2	Inspection:
16.4.2.1	Residential
16.4.2.2	Commercial
16.4.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.
16.5	<b>Building Move (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b> *Note: encroachment permit only; other fees may apply
16.5.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.5.2	Inspection:
16.5.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.
16.6	<b>Right-of-way - Obstruction (street/parking space) (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b> private property to accommodate the proposed use. If a permit is granted, such
16.6.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.6.2	Inspection:
16.6.2.1	Parking space obstruction (per calendar day)
16.6.2.2	Dumpster/Drop Storage (if approved)
16.6.2.3	Restoration Security Deposit not required
16.7	<b>Street excavation (steel plates, trenching) (One week from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>
16.7.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.7.2	Inspection:
16.7.2.1	up to 200 sq ft
16.7.2.2	each additional 50 sq ft.
16.7.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.
16.8	<b>Traffic Control (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>
16.8.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.8.2	Inspection:
16.8.2.1	Mobile (temporary set up) - per day
16.8.2.2	Fixed (long-term) - per week

Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis				
		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity
[9]	Actual Hours			2.00			\$ -	\$ 476	\$ -	\$ 476
	Fixed Fee						\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 302
	Fixed Fee (Increment)			0.50			\$ -	\$ 76	\$ -	\$ 76
[3,8]	Security Deposit									
[9]	Actual Hours			2.00			\$ -	\$ 476	\$ -	\$ 476
	Fixed Fee						\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 302
	Fixed Fee			4.00			\$ -	\$ 605	\$ -	\$ 605
[3,8]	Security Deposit									
[9]	Actual Hours			4.00			\$ -	\$ 953	\$ -	\$ 953
	Fixed Fee						\$ -	\$ 1,210	\$ -	\$ 1,210
[3,8]	Security Deposit									
[9]	Actual Hours			2.00			\$ -	\$ 476	\$ -	\$ 476
	Per Day						\$ -	\$ 76	\$ -	\$ 76
	Per Week			1.00			\$ -	\$ 151	\$ -	\$ 151
[9]	Actual Hours			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
	Fixed Fee						\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 302
	Fixed Fee (Increment)			1.00			\$ -	\$ 151	\$ -	\$ 151
[3,8]	Security Deposit									
[9]	Actual Hours			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
	Per Day						\$ -	\$ 151	\$ -	\$ 151
	Per Week			3.00			\$ -	\$ 454	\$ -	\$ 454

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis			
No.	Description		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity	Combined Total Cost
16.8.2.3	Traffic Signal Adjustment - (per day, per intersection)					1.50		\$ -	\$ 227	\$ -	\$ 227
16.8.3	Restoration Security Deposit not required										
16.9	<b>Sewer lateral in street right-of-way or easement (per lateral) (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>										
16.9.1	Plan Review (if required)	[9]		1.00				\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
16.9.2	Inspections					4.00		\$ -	\$ 605	\$ -	\$ 605
16.9.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.	[3.8]									
16.10	<b>Sidewalk café (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b> NOTE: also requires encroachment agreement										
16.10.1	Plan Review (if required)	[9]		1.00				\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
16.10.2	Inspections					3.00		\$ -	\$ 454	\$ -	\$ 454
16.10.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.	[3.8]									
16.11	<b>Other Inspection Charges</b>										
16.11.1	Reinspection, for reasons such as failure to schedule an inspection, work not ready for a requested inspection, and failed or improper work done without an inspection which must be redone (one hour minimum)	[9]				1.00		\$ -	\$ 151	\$ -	\$ 151
16.11.2	Special inspection requests, other than regular business hours (2 hour minimum charge)	[9]				2.00		\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 302
16.11.3	Specialty inspection										
16.11.3.1	a. Materials sampling, compaction testing and special materials testing	[10]									
16.11.3.2	b. Sewer air Test and Televising (per call out)	[10]									
17	<b>Environmental Review</b>										
17.1	Staff prepared environmental analysis	[2,9]		6.00				\$ -	\$ 1,429	\$ -	\$ 1,429
17.2	Consultant prepared environmental analysis	[12,0]	80.00					\$ 13,717	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,717
17.3	Peer review by consultant	[2,10]	4.00					\$ 686	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 686
17.4	Staff review of consultant-prepared analysis/review	[2]	5.00					\$ 857	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 857
17.5	Agency Filing Fees	[2,9]						various			
17.6	Document Processing	[2]	1.50					\$ 257	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 257
18	<b>Flood Zone/FEMA/Drainage</b>										
	<b>NOTE: Includes one review and one revision</b>										
18.1	Flood Zone Verification Certificate			1.00				\$ -	\$ 132	\$ -	\$ 132
18.2	Flood Zone Verification Certificate (requiring additional analysis due to location of structure relative to floodplain)		2.00	2.00				\$ -	\$ 741	\$ -	\$ 741
18.3	Flood Elevation Certificate		2.00	4.00				\$ -	\$ 1,217	\$ -	\$ 1,217
18.4											
18.5	Flood Zone Construction Permit			1.00	2.00			\$ -	\$ 609	\$ -	\$ 609
18.6	FEMA application review for LOMA's, CLOMA's, LOMR's, CLOMR's, etc			4.00	6.00			\$ -	\$ 1,958	\$ -	\$ 1,958
18.7	Drainage investigations (per hour)	[9]				1.00		\$ -	\$ 151	\$ -	\$ 151

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity	
No.	Description
<b>19 General/Specific Plans</b>	
19.1	Plan Amendment
19.2	General Plan/Zoning Ordinance Reimbursement Fee (.0025 x Building Permit Valuation)
<b>20 Grading and Erosion Control Permit</b>	
Note: No permit required for grading in an area < 50 cubic yards and not hillside. For more detail and additional exemptions see CMC 16.10.030 (b) and (c).	
<b>20.1 Grading Permit Processing, Administration &amp; Other Fees</b>	
20.1.1	Application Processing
20.1.2	Filing fee exclusive of processing and inspection fees
20.1.3	Pad certification
20.1.4	Stockpile and erosion control monitoring (per calendar day)
20.1.5	Wet Season Work Authorization (October 15 - April 15) - Per Week
Note: Must obtain approval from inspector prior to commencing grading work during wet weather.	
<b>20.1.6 Refundable Security Deposit for Grading Permits:</b>	
20.1.6.1	Erosion Control Deposit - 100% cost of grading, removal of associated nuisances/hazards, may include installation of erosion & sediment control measures.
20.1.6.2	See Recycling Program fees and Performance Security Deposit for information on additional construction & demolition security deposit requirements (Section 36).
<b>20.2 Grading Plan Review</b>	
Note: All plan review fees include one initial submission and two revisions. Any additional plan review required will be charged at an hourly rate, and will require an adequate deposit to a trust account prior to commencement.	
<b>Standard Grading Plan Review Fees:</b>	
20.2.1	Single lot in (a non-hillside) location up to 100 cubic yards
20.2.2	Single lot in (a hillside) location up to 100 cubic yards
20.2.3	101-1,000 cubic yards, for the first 100 cubic yards
20.2.4	Plus for each additional 100 cubic yards or fraction thereof
20.2.5	1,001-10,000 cubic yards, for the first 1,000 cubic yards
20.2.6	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof
20.2.7	10,001-100,000 cubic yards, for the first 10,000 cubic yards
20.2.8	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof
20.2.9	Over 100,000 cubic yards, for first 100,000 cubic yards
20.2.10	Plus each additional 10,000 cu yds
20.2.11	Additional plan review beyond two revisions (see note)
<b>Special Grading Plan Review Fees:</b>	
20.3	New Pool - Plan Review
20.3.1.1	< 100 cubic yards
20.3.1.2	100 -200 cubic yards
20.4	<b>Additional document review, including SWPPP's and Soils report</b>
20.4.1	Geotechnical
20.4.2	SWPPP
20.4.3	<i>Mylar Maps and Plans Security Deposit: \$200/page OR Minimum: \$500 (Plans)</i>

Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis				
		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity
[9]	Actual Hours	80.00		4.00			\$ 13,717	\$ 953		\$ 14,670
[6]	Fixed Fee									\$ -
[2]	Fixed Fee		1.00				\$ -	\$ 132	\$ -	\$ 132
	Fixed Fee		0.50				\$ -	\$ 66	\$ -	\$ 66
	Fixed Fee			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
	Per Day				0.25		\$ -	\$ 38	\$ -	\$ 38
	Per week				0.50		\$ -	\$ 76	\$ -	\$ 76
[8]	Security Deposit									
[2]	Fixed Fee			1.50			\$ -	\$ 357	\$ -	\$ 357
	Fixed Fee			2.00			\$ -	\$ 476	\$ -	\$ 476
	Fixed Fee			2.00			\$ -	\$ 476	\$ -	\$ 476
	Fixed Fee (Incremental)			0.50			\$ -	\$ 119	\$ -	\$ 119
	Fixed Fee			6.50			\$ -	\$ 1,548	\$ -	\$ 1,548
	Fixed Fee (Incremental)			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
	Fixed Fee			15.50			\$ -	\$ 3,692	\$ -	\$ 3,692
	Fixed Fee (Incremental)			0.40			\$ -	\$ 95	\$ -	\$ 95
	Fixed Fee			51.50			\$ -	\$ 12,267	\$ -	\$ 12,267
	Fixed Fee (Incremental)			0.30			\$ -	\$ 71	\$ -	\$ 71
[9]	Actual Hours			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
[2]	Fixed Fee			2.00			\$ -	\$ 476	\$ -	\$ 476
[2]	Fixed Fee			3.00			\$ -	\$ 715	\$ -	\$ 715
[2,9]	Actual Hours			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
[2,9]	Actual Hours			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
[2,8]	Security Deposit									



Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity	
No.	Description
23.2.7	Plan Re-Check (hourly)
23.3	<b>Improvement Inspection **</b> ** Note: The permit fee includes inspections made during the specified timeline only.
23.3.1	Base Cost - Improvements ≤ \$100,000, plus cost per \$5K increment or less (30 days to complete). See Note**.
23.3.2	per each addtl \$5,000 increment, or fraction thereof
23.3.3	Base Cost - improvement cost \$100,001 - \$500,000, plus cost per \$5K increment (90 days to complete) See Note**.
23.3.4	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$100,000, or fraction thereof
23.3.5	Base Cost - Improvement cost > \$500,001, plus cost of \$5K increment (180 days to complete) See Note**.
23.3.6	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$500,000, or fraction thereof
23.3.7	C.3 service fee for permits increasing impervious surface (percent of valuation)
23.4	<b>Security Deposits and Bond Requirements</b> Note: Additional requirements may be identified in the Conditions of Approval for each project
23.4.1	Mylar Maps and Plans Security Deposit: \$200/page, minimum of \$500 (to guarantee submission/return of final maps/plans to City)
23.4.2	Improvement Security Deposit/Bond (if required) 110% of construction costs + 100% contractor/subcontractors/labor & material costs
23.4.3	Performance Bond (if required) 110% of construction costs
23.4.4	Fee associated with calling a bond (if required); to be funded from bond proceeds
23.4.5	See Recycling Program fees and Performance Security Deposit for information on additional Construction & Demolition security deposit requirements
24	<b>Inclusionary Housing (Placeholder for MFS; Not included in cost analysis)</b>
24.1	In-lieu Fee per market-rate housing unit
24.1.1	Rental (per unit)
24.1.2	Ownership (per unit)
24.2	Compliance Monitoring
24.2.1	Rental (annual)
24.2.2	Ownership (per change of ownership)
25	<b>Map Reviews</b>
25.1	<b>Tentative Maps</b>
25.1.1	Tentative Parcel Map Review (also known as a Tentative Minor Subdivision Map)
25.1.2	Plus per lot
25.1.3	Amendment to Minor Subdivision
25.1.4	Extension to Minor Subdivision
25.1.5	Tentative Major Subdivision Map Review (Also known as a Tract Map)
25.1.6	Plus Per Lot
25.1.7	Amendment to Major Subdivision
25.1.8	Extension to Major Subdivision

Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis			
		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity
[2.9]	Actual Hours			1.00		\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
[2]	Fixed Fee					\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 302
[2]	Fixed Fee (Increment)					\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 302
[2]	Fixed Fee			42.00		\$ -	\$ 6,350	\$ -	\$ 6,350
[2]	Fixed Fee (Increment)					\$ -	\$ 227	\$ -	\$ 227
[2]	Fixed Fee			162.00		\$ -	\$ 24,493	\$ -	\$ 24,493
[2]	Fixed Fee (Increment)					\$ -	\$ 151	\$ -	\$ 151
[3]	Valuation-Based								
[3.8]	Security Deposit								
[3.8]	Bond or Security Deposit								
[3.8]	Bond or Security Deposit								
[9]	Actual Hours								
[3.8]	Security Deposit								
[3]									
	Fixed Fee			10.00		\$ -	\$ 2,382	\$ -	\$ 2,382
	Fixed Fee (Incremental)			1.00		\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
	Fixed Fee			3.00		\$ -	\$ 715	\$ -	\$ 715
	Fixed Fee			2.00		\$ -	\$ 476	\$ -	\$ 476
	Fixed Fee			16.00		\$ -	\$ 3,811	\$ -	\$ 3,811
	Fixed Fee (Incremental)			1.00		\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
	Fixed Fee	20.00		6.00		\$ 3,429	\$ 1,429	\$ -	\$ 4,858
	Fixed Fee	4.00		2.00		\$ 686	\$ 476	\$ -	\$ 1,162

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity	
No.	Description
25.2	<b>Parcel Maps (Minor Subdivision Maps) - recorded map process</b>
25.2.1	Parcel Map processing fees
25.2.2	Parcel Map review
	Plus Per Lot
25.2.3	
25.2.4	Parcel Map Filing
25.2.5	Mylar Maps and Plans Security Deposit: \$200/page OR Minimum: \$500 (Parcel Map) and \$1,000 (Final Map)
25.3	<b>Final Maps (Major Subdivision or Tract Maps)</b>
25.3.1	Final Map processing fees
25.3.2	Final Map Review
	Per Lot
25.3.3	
25.3.4	Map Re-review
25.3.5	Final Map Filing
25.3.6	Mylar Maps and Plans Security Deposit: \$200/page OR Minimum: \$500 (Parcel Map) and \$1,000 (Final Map)
25.4	<b>Agreements</b>
25.4.1	Subdivision Agreement
25.4.2	Amendment to Subdivision Agreement
25.4.3	Improvement Agreement
25.4.4	Amendment of Improvement Agreement (Minor Subdivisions)
25.5	<b>Other Map Changes</b>
25.5.1	Special engineering analysis
25.5.2	Charge for Filing of New Street Monuments (each)
25.5.3	Charge for new lot creation (per lot)
25.5.4	Lot line adjustment (between 2 parcels)
25.5.5	Each additional parcel
25.5.6	Parcel merge (between 2 parcels)
25.5.7	Each additional parcel
25.5.8	Certificate of Compliance
25.5.9	Certification of Correction Review
25.5.10	Update of City Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drain Base Maps
25.5.10.1	Minor Subdivision
25.5.10.2	Major Subdivision
25.6	<b>Easement, Dedication, Vacation, Abandonment</b>
25.6.1	Application for vacation or abandonment of property rights
25.6.2	Acceptance of easements and dedications
25.6.2.1	Acceptance by City Council
25.6.2.2	Acceptance by City Staff
25.6.3	Reversion to acreage or record of survey filing fee
25.6.4	Assessment District Reapportionment (CMC 78-32)
25.6.4.1	Application Fee
25.6.4.2	Review - Hearing Method
25.6.4.3	Review - Alternative Method
25.7	Development Plan Review and additional plan checking as required, due to substantial plan alterations
26	<b>Neighborhood Preservation</b>
26.1	Reinspection Fee
26.2	Extension Fee
26.3	Graffiti and Summary Abatement

Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis					
		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity	Combined Total Cost
			1.50								
[2]	Fixed Fee			15.00		\$ -	\$ 198			\$ 198	
	Fixed Fee					\$ -	\$ 3,573			\$ 3,573	
	Fixed Fee (Incremental)			1.00		\$ -	\$ 238			\$ 238	
	Fixed Fee			10.00		\$ -	\$ 2,382			\$ 2,382	
[8]	Security Deposit										
[2]	Fixed Fee		1.50			\$ -	\$ 198			\$ 198	
	Fixed Fee			20.00		\$ -	\$ 4,764			\$ 4,764	
	Fixed Fee (Incremental)			1.00		\$ -	\$ 238			\$ 238	
[2]	Fixed Fee		1.00	4.00		\$ -	\$ 1,085			\$ 1,085	
	Fixed Fee			10.00		\$ -	\$ 2,382			\$ 2,382	
[8]	Security Deposit										
[2]	Fixed Fee		2.00	30.00		\$ -	\$ 7,410			\$ 7,410	
	Fixed Fee		2.00	20.00		\$ -	\$ 5,028			\$ 5,028	
[2]	Fixed Fee		2.00	30.00		\$ -	\$ 7,410			\$ 7,410	
	Fixed Fee		2.00	20.00		\$ -	\$ 5,028			\$ 5,028	
[10]	Cost + Admin Fee										
	Fixed Fee		2.00			\$ -	\$ 264			\$ 264	
	Fixed Fee			2.00		\$ -	\$ 476			\$ 476	
	Fixed Fee	2.00		5.00	1.00	\$ 343	\$ 1,191	\$ 139		\$ 1,673	
	Fixed Fee			1.00		\$ -	\$ 238			\$ 238	
	Fixed Fee	2.00		5.00		\$ 343	\$ 1,191			\$ 1,534	
	Fixed Fee			1.00		\$ -	\$ 238			\$ 238	
	Fixed Fee			5.00		\$ -	\$ 1,191			\$ 1,191	
	Fixed Fee			5.00		\$ -	\$ 1,191			\$ 1,191	
	Fixed Fee			2.00		\$ -	\$ 476			\$ 476	
	Fixed Fee			4.00		\$ -	\$ 953			\$ 953	
	Fixed Fee	10.00		6.00		\$ 1,715	\$ 1,429			\$ 3,144	
	Fixed Fee			10.00		\$ -	\$ 2,382			\$ 2,382	
	Fixed Fee			5.00		\$ -	\$ 1,191			\$ 1,191	
	Fixed Fee			3.00		\$ -	\$ 715			\$ 715	
	Fixed Fee			1.00		\$ -	\$ 238			\$ 238	
	Fixed Fee			60.00		\$ -	\$ 14,292			\$ 14,292	
	Fixed Fee			3.00		\$ -	\$ 715			\$ 715	
[9]	Actual Hours			3.00		\$ -	\$ 715			\$ 715	
	Fixed Fee					1.00	\$ -	\$ 122		\$ 122	
	Fixed Fee					1.00	\$ -	\$ 139		\$ 139	
	Actual Hours or Cost + Admin Fee					\$ -		Actual Cost		Actual Cost	

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis			
No.	Description		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity	Combined Total Cost
26.4	Public Nuisance Administrative Fines (Per Government Code Sections 53069.4, 25132(b), and 36900(b))	[3]									
	First issuance in 12 months	[3]									
	Second issuance in 12 months	[3]									
	Third and subsequent issuance in 12 months	[3]									
26.5	Annual Multiple Family Rental Dwelling Unit Inspection and Maintenance Fee (per unit)										
	Failure to pay fee after due date	[3]									
	31 - 60 days after due date, percent of initial fee	[3]									
	61 - 90 days after due date, percent of initial fee	[3]									
	90 days or more after due date, percent of initial fee	[3]									
	Application fee for self certification										
26.6	Building and Safety Code Violations (Per Government Code Sections 53069.4, 25132(c), and 36900(c))	[3]									
	First issuance in 12 months	[3]									
	Second issuance in 12 months	[3]									
	Third and subsequent issuance in 12 months	[3]									
26.7	Confiscated Signs (CMC 122-1029)										
	First violation	[3]									
	Second violation	[3]									
	Third violation	[3]									
	Plus Citation	[3]									
	Plus Reinspection Fee	[3]									
26.8	Request for Exemption for Small Collection Facilities for Nonprofit Organizations (CMC 82-113)										
	Fixed Fee						3.00			\$ 255	\$ 255
27	Off-Site Street Improvement Program (OSIP) (CMC 78-154)	[3]									
27.1	Single family unit (per dwelling unit)										
	Secondary living unit										
27.2	Multi family unit, including condominium and townhouse (per dwelling unit)										
27.3	Commercial (per gross sq. ft.)										
27.4	Office (per gross sq. ft.)										
27.5	Industrial (per gross sq. ft.)										
27.6	Mini-storage (per gross sq. ft.)										
28	Other Community Development Fees										
28.1	Abatement Hearing (by the Zoning Administrator)							\$ 1,372			\$ 1,372
28.2	Street Name Change							\$ -			
28.2.1	Ping (included 8 hrs for IT and coord with PD,Fire)							\$ 1,372			\$ 1,372
28.3	Continuance of Hearing Item										
28.3.1	Continuance by Applicant							\$ 1,372			\$ 1,372
28.3.2	Republication and renotification	[10]						cost of publication			\$ -
29	Oversized Load Permit										
29.1	A single day vehicle movement	[7]						\$ 1,372	\$ 66		\$ 1,438
29.2	Multiple movements of a vehicle for a one-year period (special conditions may apply)	[7]						\$ 1,372	\$ 66		\$ 1,438
30	Park Land (Placeholder only; not included in analysis)	[3]									
30.1	Rural Residential-Conservation/Low-Density Residential Designations; Park Land Requirement - 697 sq. ft. (per unit)										
		[3]									
		[3]									
		[3]									
		[3]									
30.2	Medium-Density Designation; Park Land Requirement - 479 sq. ft.										
		[3]									
		[3]									
		[3]									
		[3]									
30.3	High-Density Designation; Park Land Requirement - 414 sq. ft. (per unit)										
		[3]									
		[3]									
		[3]									



Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis			
No.	Description		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity	Combined Total Cost
36.5	Sewer Service charge (annual)	[3]									
37	<b>Sidewalk Repair Administrative Fee</b> (Sections 5600 et seq. of the CA Streets & Highways Code)	Fixed Fee				1.00		\$ 151			\$ 151
38	<b>Special Administration</b>										
38.1	Agreement processing not related to subdivisions										
38.1.1	Council action not required	[2]			8.00			\$ -	\$ 1,906	\$ -	\$ 1,906
38.1.2	Council action required	[2]			16.00			\$ -	\$ 3,811	\$ -	\$ 3,811
38.2	Acceptance of new public improvements				8.00			\$ -	\$ 1,906	\$ -	\$ 1,906
38.3	After-hours permit request review/approval	[2]						\$ -	\$ 66	\$ -	\$ 66
38.4	Permit extension request	[2]						\$ -	\$ 132	\$ -	\$ 132
38.5	Project archiving and closeout (major projects only)	[9]		8.00				\$ -	\$ 1,058	\$ -	\$ 1,058
38.6	Penalties										
38.6.1	Penalty for commencing work without permit (note: repeat offenders will be subject to increasing penalties at the discretion of the City Engineer)	[3]									
38.6.2	Penalty for work done without scheduling the required inspection (note: repeat offenders will be subject to increasing penalties at the discretion of the City Engineer)	[3]									
39	<b>Storm Water Treatment Controls</b>										
39.1	<b>Permit Processing, Administration &amp; Other Fees</b>										
39.1.1	Pre-Engineering (For initial meeting)	[2]			2.00			\$ -	\$ 476	\$ -	\$ 476
39.1.2	Application processing							\$ -	\$ 132	\$ -	\$ 132
39.1.3	Filing fee exclusive of processing and inspection fees	[2]						\$ -	\$ 66	\$ -	\$ 66
39.2	<b>Storm Water Treatment Controls Plan Review *</b> * Include initial submission and two revisions										
39.2.1	Base Cost (Improvements cost ≤ \$100,000, plus cost per \$5K increment)	[2]			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
39.2.2	per each addtl \$5,000 increment, or fraction thereof	[2]			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
39.2.3	Base Cost (improvement cost \$100,001 - \$500,000, plus cost per \$5K increment)	[2]			21.00			\$ -	\$ 5,002	\$ -	\$ 5,002
39.2.4	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$100,000, or fraction thereof	[2]			0.75			\$ -	\$ 179	\$ -	\$ 179
39.2.5	Base Cost (Improvement cost > \$500,001, plus cost per \$5K increment)	[2]			81.00			\$ -	\$ 19,294	\$ -	\$ 19,294
39.2.6	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$500,000, or fraction thereof	[2]			0.50			\$ -	\$ 119	\$ -	\$ 119
39.2.7	Plan Re-Check (hourly)	[9]			1.00			\$ -	\$ 238	\$ -	\$ 238
39.3	<b>Storm Water Treatment Controls</b>										
39.3.1	Base Improvement cost ≤ \$100,000, plus cost of \$5K increment	[2]				2.00		\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 302
39.3.2	per each addtl \$5,000 increment, or fraction thereof	[2]				2.00		\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 302
39.3.3	Base Improvement cost \$100,001 - \$500,000, plus cost of \$5K increment	[2]				42.00		\$ -	\$ 6,350	\$ -	\$ 6,350
39.3.4	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$100,000, or fraction thereof	[2]				1.50		\$ -	\$ 227	\$ -	\$ 227
39.3.5	Improvement cost > \$500,001, plus cost of \$5K increment	[2]				162.00		\$ -	\$ 24,493	\$ -	\$ 24,493
39.3.6	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$500,000, or fraction thereof	[2]				1.00		\$ -	\$ 151	\$ -	\$ 151
39.3.7	Review of Operations & Maintenance Agreement	[2]				10.00		\$ -	\$ 1,512	\$ -	\$ 1,512
39.3.8	Annual Inspection of Stormwater Treatment Control	[2]				2.00		\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 302

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis			
No.	Description		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity	Combined Total Cost
40	TERPS (Terminal Instrument Procedures Study)	[10] Cost + Admin Fee									
41	<b>Tree Preservation &amp; Protection</b>										
41.1	Heritage Tree Designation	Fixed Fee	8.00					\$ 1,372	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,372
41.2	Tree Removal	[1,9] Actual Hours	4.00					\$ 686	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 686
42	<b>Use Permit</b>										
42.1	Minor Use Permit										\$ -
42.1.1	Existing building without hearing	[2] Fixed Fee	6.00		2.00		0.50	\$ 1,029	\$ 476	\$ 70	\$ 1,575
42.1.2	Existing building with hearing	[2] Fixed Fee	8.00		3.00		0.50	\$ 1,372	\$ 715	\$ 70	\$ 2,156
42.1.3	New Construction without hearing	[2] Fixed Fee	12.00		4.00		1.00	\$ 2,058	\$ 953	\$ 139	\$ 3,149
42.1.4	New Construction with hearing	[2] Fixed Fee	20.00		7.00		1.00	\$ 3,429	\$ 1,667	\$ 139	\$ 5,236
42.2	Large Family Day Care Home	Fixed Fee	10.00		3.50		1.00	\$ 1,715	\$ 834	\$ 139	\$ 2,687
42.3	Home Based Business - Visiting Clientele	Fixed Fee	4.00					\$ 686			\$ 686
42.4	Wireless Communications Facilities	Fixed Fee	30.00		6.00		0.50	\$ 5,144	\$ 1,429	\$ 70	\$ 6,642
42.5	Minor Use Permit Amendment										
42.5.1	With hearing	Fixed Fee	4.00		1.00		0.50	\$ 686	\$ 238	\$ 70	\$ 994
42.5.2	Without hearing	Fixed Fee	2.00		1.00		0.50	\$ 343	\$ 238	\$ 70	\$ 651
42.6	Minor Use Permit Extension										
42.6.1	With hearing	Fixed Fee	4.00					\$ 686			\$ 686
42.6.2	Without hearing	Fixed Fee	2.00					\$ 343			\$ 343
42.7	Major Use Permit										
42.7.1	Existing Building	[2,9] Actual Hours	10.00		2.00		1.00	\$ 1,715	\$ 476	\$ 139	\$ 2,330
42.7.2	New Construction	[2,9] Actual Hours	25.00		10.00		1.00	\$ 4,286	\$ 2,382	\$ 139	\$ 6,807
42.8	Variance										
42.8.1	Residential variance	Fixed Fee	8.00		2.00		0.50	\$ 1,372	\$ 476	\$ 70	\$ 1,918
42.8.2	Variance (non-residential)	[1,9] Actual Hours	12.00		2.00			\$ 2,058	\$ 476		\$ 2,534
42.8.3	Reasonable Accommodation	Fixed Fee	4.00					\$ 686	\$ -		\$ 686
42.8.4	Variance Extension	Fixed Fee	4.00					\$ 686	\$ -		\$ 686
43	<b>Zoning Amendment</b>										
43.1	Rezoning Application	[9] Actual Hours	80.00					\$ 13,717			\$ 13,717
43.2	Zoning Text Amendment	[9] Actual Hours	80.00					\$ 13,717			\$ 13,717
44	<b>Zoning Verification Letter</b>	[2] Fixed Fee	2.50					\$ 429			\$ 429
<b>OTHER FEES:</b>											
45	Refund processing fee (for overpayments < \$15 - see notes section)	[2,13] Fixed Fee									
46	Deposit forfeiture (security deposits or trust accounts left unclaimed after 4 years - see notes section)	[2,13] Unclaimed Deposit									

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis			
No.	Description		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity	Combined Total Cost
<b>HOURLY RATE WITH OVERHEAD</b>											
47	Planning Services	[9]	1.00					\$ 171			\$ 171
48	Expedited Planning Services - performed by consultant	[1,10]						actual cost			actual cost
<b>Engineering Services</b>											
49.1	Processing	[9]		1.00				\$ 132			\$ 132
49.2	Engineering Plan Check	[9]			1.00			\$ 238			\$ 238
49.3	Engineering Inspection	[9]				1.00		\$ 151			\$ 151
<b>Building Services</b>											
50.1	Processing	[9]					1.00			\$ 85	\$ 85
50.2	Plan Check	[9]					1.00			\$ 139	\$ 139
50.3	Inspection	[9]					1.00			\$ 122	\$ 122
	For services requested of City staff which have no fee listed in this fee schedule, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the established hourly rates for this division. Additionally, the City will pass-through to the applicant any discrete costs incurred from the use of external service providers if required to process the specific application, including an administrative fee of 20% to cover the associated Citywide overhead costs.										
<b>TOTAL CED DEPARTMENT</b>											

- Notes**
- [1] Calculation per Building Cost of Service Analysis (COS)
  - [2] New Fee / Significantly Modified Fee Structure
  - [3] Placeholder for Master Fee Schedule (MFS); Not included in cost analysis
  - [4] Current Fee listed is for Planning only
  - [5] Recommended policy for combination projects is to collect the deposit for each application as if it is a stand alone application; it is more efficient and cost effective to refund money; see Trust Account Deposit footnotes below (9 and 10)
  - [6] General Plan fee - separate calculation
  - [7] Fee set by State maximum
  - [8] **Security Deposits** are required in an amount equal to the expected cost of restoring City property, public infrastructure or right-of-way to its original condition. Security deposits (otherwise refundable) may be applied by the City to any unpaid fees, hourly charges, or other costs associated with the project, after construction or other pledged purposes have been met. Applicants must request refunds of security deposits within 30 days of acceptance by the City or 30 days of permit finalization (unless otherwise stated in the Master Fee Schedule.) Any deposits unclaimed after four years from the date of the deposit will be forfeited.
  - [9] **Trust Account Deposit Required.** Fees billed on an hourly basis require an upfront deposit of estimated fees (see "Trust Account Information" below); the totals provided on this line item represent the required minimum deposit. The Chief Building Official, City Engineer, Planning Manager or Economic Development Manager may adjust the required minimum deposit based on the project parameters and any additional information they may have.
  - [10] **Trust Account Deposit Required.** All outside consultant costs required for the project are billed at actual cost plus 20% administrative costs; a deposit to a trust account is required prior to any work commencing, and will be calculated based upon the consultant's estimate (including any contingency amount) plus 20%. Funds will be drawn down from the applicant's trust account as needed to pay the actual invoices and associated 20% admin fee on amounts paid.

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity	
No.	Description

- [11] **Security Deposit Information (Refundable)** In instances where the proposed permitted work may result in damage to public right of ways or property, security deposits are generally required. Unless otherwise stated in the Master Fee Schedule or Conditions of Approval, requests for refund of security deposits must be submitted to the City within 30 days of acceptance or permit finalization. All unclaimed deposits are automatically forfeited four years from the date of the deposit.
- [12] **Trust Account Information** In instances where fees are billed based on actual hours spent, or where a deposit to a trust account is required in order to fund outside costs, a trust account is required to be funded by applicant. Funds will be drawn down from the applicant's trust account as needed to pay the actual hours, outside costs and associated 20% administrative fees. Refunds of unused trust account balances will be provided upon request; any amounts remaining in an inactive trust account will be forfeited by the depositor and/or applicant (if the remaining balance is \$15 or less, account will be considered inactive after one year from date of last transaction, all others will be considered inactive after four years from date of last transaction.)
- [13] **Overpayment Information** Any permit overpayment made by check of \$15 or more will be processed for refund by check. Such refunds may take up to three weeks. Any permit overpayment made by check less than \$15 will be forfeited by the applicant, as the cost to the City of processing such refunds exceeds the refund amount. Overpayments made by credit card follow the same guidelines unless the charge can be voided and correctly processed.
- [14] **See Admin Fees** - Consistent with Admin Fees

Fee Basis	Planning Time Estimates	Engineering Time Estimates			Building Time Estimates	CED Cost Analysis			
		Estimated Average Labor Time Processing Activity (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Plan Review (hours)	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Inspection Activity (hours)		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Planning Cost of Service Per Activity	Engineering Cost of Service Per Activity	Building Cost of Service Per Activity

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis						Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis				
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Combined Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
		Ping	Eng	Bldg								
				\$ 85								
	<i>Hourly Rates</i>											
1	<b>Administrative Permit</b> (does not include design review)											
1.1	New Use	Fixed Fee \$ 469	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 641	110%	\$ 581	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
1.2	Change of Use/Tenant	Fixed Fee \$ 469	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 641	156%	\$ 410	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
1.3	Temporary Use	Fixed Fee \$ 186	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 358	62%	\$ 581	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
1.4	Home Based Business	Fixed Fee \$ 90	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90	210%	\$ 43	100%	23	\$ 2,070	\$ 986	
1.5	Minor Exception	Fixed Fee \$ 469	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 641	110%	\$ 581	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
1.6	Secondary Living Unit	Fixed Fee \$ 1,159	\$ 688	\$ -	\$ 1,847	186%	\$ 991	100%	1	\$ 1,847	\$ 991	
1.7	Sidewalk Café Pre-Application Review (also requires Encroachment Permit - see section 17)	Fixed Fee \$ 186	\$ 516	\$ -	\$ 702	171%	\$ 410	100%	1	\$ 702	\$ 410	
1.8	Business License (Planning Review)	Fixed Fee \$ 100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	233%	\$ 43	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
1.9	Vendor Permit	Fixed Fee \$ 438	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 610	0%	\$ 581	100%	10	\$ 6,100	\$ 5,811	
1.10	Seasonal Outdoor Sales	Fixed Fee \$ 584	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 584	341%	\$ 171	100%	9	\$ 5,256	\$ 1,543	
1.11	Seasonal Outdoor Sales - Refundable Security Deposit	Security Deposit \$ 2,500			\$ 2,500		Security Deposit \$2,500		9			
2	<b>Animal Permit</b>											
		Actual Hours \$ 389	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 389	113%	Deposit \$500	100%	3	\$ 1,167	\$ 1,029	
3	<b>Annexation</b>											
3.1	Planning Review	Actual Hours \$ 2,000		\$ -	\$ 2,000	10%	Deposit \$25,000	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
3.2	Engineering Review:											
3.2.1	Area of 2.5 acres or less	Fixed Fee \$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000	70%	\$ 2,858	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
3.2.2	Area larger than 2.5 acres, but not larger than 25 acres	Fixed Fee \$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000	74%	\$ 4,049	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
3.2.3	Area larger than 25 acres	Fixed Fee \$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000	73%	\$ 5,478	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
3.3	Out of area sewer service application (LAFCO application processing)	Fixed Fee \$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000	84%	\$ 2,382	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
4	<b>Appeal</b>											
4.1	Of Staff Interpretation (+ Public Notification D.35)	Fixed Fee \$ 99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 99	19%	\$ 514	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
4.2	To Planning Commission (+ Public Notification D.35)	Fixed Fee \$ 99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 99	7%	\$ 1,372	100%	2	\$ 198	\$ 2,743	
4.3	To City Council (+ Public Notification D.35)	Fixed Fee \$ 99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 99	5%	\$ 2,058	100%	1	\$ 99	\$ 2,058	
5	<b>Application Acceptability Review</b>											
		Fixed Fee \$ 146	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 318	78%	\$ 410	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
6	<b>Building Move/Relocation Application</b> NOTE: Encroachment and/or Building permits may be required.											
		Actual Hours \$ 1,159	\$ 344	\$ -	\$ 1,503	163%	Deposit \$1,500	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	
7	<b>Building Permit, Plan Review &amp; Inspection</b>											
7.1	<b>Administrative Fee (per each application)</b>			\$ 30	\$ 30	100%	See Building Cost Analysis	100%	857	\$ 25,710	\$ 30,413	
7.2	<b>Plan Review - Building Code Compliance Component</b>  NOTE: Includes required plan review for all construction codes adopted by the City. The fee includes one round of comments plus one back check. Additional plan review required following the back check will be charged based upon the plan review hourly rate.											
7.2.1	Express Review / Expedited Plan Review (Using Outside Consultants)	Actual Hours or Cost + Admin Fee \$ 146	\$ 172	Table 3c	\$ 318	100%	Actual Cost or Cost + Admin Fee	100%		\$ -	\$ -	
7.2.2	Valuation-based Plan Review			Table 3c			See Building Cost Analysis			\$ 677,000	\$ 304,976	
7.2.3	Valuation-based Plan Review - Plumbing/Electrical/Mechanical (PEM) only			Table 3c			See Building Cost Analysis			\$ 69,000	\$ 139,300	
7.3	<b>Additional Plan Review - Planning &amp; Engineering</b>  NOTE: Includes required plan review for all construction codes adopted by the City. The fee includes one round of comments plus one back check. Additional plan review required following the back check will be charged based upon the plan review hourly rate.											
7.3.1	Initial Application Review	Fixed Fee \$ 146	\$ 172		\$ 318	105%	\$ 304	100%		\$ -	\$ -	
7.3.2	Plot Plan (Final Grading and Drainage Improvements)											

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis						Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis				
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Combined Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
		Plng	Eng	Bldg								
7.3.3	Review (single lot, part of subdivision)	\$ -	\$ 172		\$ 172	42%	\$ 410	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7.4	Other Plan Review as Required	\$ 146	\$ 172		\$ 318	78%	Hourly	295	\$ 93,810	\$ 120,848	\$ 120,848.06	
7.4.1	<b>Building Permit Inspection Fees</b>											
	NOTE: Includes required inspections for all construction codes adopted by the City.											
7.4.2	Valuation-based Inspection Fees			Table 3c			See Building Cost Analysis		\$ 1,075,000	\$ 1,179,402	\$ 1,179,402	
7.4.3	Valuation-based Inspection - Plumbing/Electrical/Mechanical (PEM) only			Table 3c			See Building Cost Analysis		\$ 409,000	\$ 280,783	\$ 280,783	
7.5	Additional Inspections			\$ 92	\$ 92	75%	\$ 122	100%				
7.5	Plot Plan (Final Grading and Drainage Improvements) Inspection (single lot, part of a subdivision)	\$ -	\$ 344	\$ -	\$ 344	100%	Hourly		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
7.6	Building Permit Stormwater Pollution Prevention Compliance (Please refer to [Section 39] for related fees.)											
7.6.1	Coordination (per 1/2 hour, 1/2 hour minimum)	\$ -	\$ 86	\$ -	\$ 86	72%	\$ 119	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
7.6.2	Additional time above minimum (per hour)	\$ -	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 172	72%	\$ 238	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
7.6.3	C.3 service fee for permits increasing impervious surface	\$ -	\$ -	.12% of valuation	.12% of valuation		.12% of valuation					
8	<b>Child Care Program (CMC 78-63) * (Placeholder for MFS; not included in cost analysis)</b>											
8.1	Non-restricted project fee due upon issuance of Certificate of Occupancy (% of value)			.5%	.5%		.5%					
8.2	Residential Projects			\$ -	\$ -							
9	<b>Condition Compliance and Mitigation Monitoring</b>											
9.1	Minor (Admin with no DRB)	\$ 146	\$ 172	\$ 109	\$ 427	45%	\$ 958	100%	8	\$ 3,416	\$ 7,666	\$ 7,666
9.2	Major (with DRB)	\$ 146	\$ 172	\$ 109	\$ 427	100%	Deposit \$15,000	100%	8	\$ 3,416	\$ 85,712	\$ 85,712.30
9.3	Stormwater Facility Certification	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	100%	Deposit \$1,500	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9.4	Specialized Condition Compliance - conducted by consultant	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	100%	Cost + Admin Fee	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10	<b>Design and Site Review</b>											
10.1	Design and Site Review											
10.1.1	Minor (Admin with no DRB)	\$ 438	\$ 172	\$ 172	\$ 782	30%	Deposit \$3,000	100%	4	\$ 3,128	\$ 10,410	\$ 10,410
10.1.2	Major (with DRB)	\$ 438	\$ 172	\$ 172	\$ 782	6%	Deposit \$15,000	100%	5	\$ 3,910	\$ 60,891	\$ 60,891
10.2	Sign Design Review	\$ 730	\$ 172	\$ 172	\$ 1,074	184%	\$ 584	100%	5	\$ 5,370	\$ 2,919	\$ 2,919
10.3	Design and Site Review Extension	\$ 387	\$ 172	\$ 172	\$ 731	142%	\$ 514	100%	1	\$ 731	\$ 514	\$ 514
10.4	Sign - Administrative Design Review											
	Staff extension	\$ 598			\$ 598	349%	\$ 171	100%	3	\$ 1,794	\$ 514	\$ 514
	Board approval extension	\$ -			\$ -	0%	\$ 343	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11	<b>Development Agreement</b>											
	Development Agreement	\$ 6,424	\$ 860	\$ -	\$ 7,284	79%	Deposit \$10,000	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12	<b>Development Project Mitigation Fee for Fire Station No. 22</b>											
12.1	Mitigation fee			\$ 3,619	\$ 3,619							
12.2	Plus Administrative fee			\$ 100	\$ 100							
13	<b>Documents, Maps, Imaging and Technology</b>											
13.1	Documents						Cost + Admin Fee					
13.1.1	Per page (per case law)				\$ 0.10		\$ 0.10					

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis						Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis					
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Combined Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee	
		Plng	Eng	Bldg									
13.2	Maps					Cost + Admin Fee							
13.3	Other					Cost + Admin Fee							
13.4	Technology Fee - Percent of Permit Fee				\$ -	7% of Fee for Plan review & Inspection	100%		\$ -	\$ 260,401	\$ 260,401		
	Document Imaging Fee (per sheet)												
13.4.1	≤ 11 x 17 - Per Sheet				\$ 1.50		88%	\$ 1.70	100%	\$ 49,500	\$ 56,181	\$ 56,181	
13.4.2	> 11 x 17 - Per Sheet				\$ 3.50		90%	\$ 3.90	100%	\$ 9,408	\$ 10,490	\$ 10,490	
13.5	Hearing Tape Copy (per tape)					Cost + Admin Fee							
13.6	Public Hearing Poster (each)					Cost + Admin Fee							
13.7	Copies of Public Documents					Cost + Admin Fee							
13.7.1	Photo copy, page size not to exceed 11"x17"					Cost + Admin Fee							
13.7.2	Prints from microfilm					Cost + Admin Fee							
13.7.3	Prints copy, page size exceeding 11"x17"					Cost + Admin Fee							
13.8	Special service microfilm research request												
13.8.1	Per hour (1/2-half hour minimum)		\$ 93		\$ 93		98%	\$ 94	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
13.8.2	Print from Microfilm (Per Sheet)					Cost of Reproduction	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
14	<b>Drainage Area Fee -- City (Placeholder for MFS; not included in cost</b>												
	Area 5 (per acre)		\$ 2,178										
	Area 7 (per acre)		\$ 3,831										
	Area 23/24 (per acre)		\$ 2,709										
	Area 50 (per acre)		\$ 4,211										
	Area 90 (per acre)		\$ 3,414										
	Area 92 (per acre)		\$ 2,417										
15	<b>Drainage Area Fee -- County</b>												
	Area 128 (per square foot)		\$ 0.17										
	Area 22 (per square foot)		\$ 0.05										
	Area 33B (per square foot)		\$ 0.70										
	Area 33C (per square foot)		\$ 0.44										
	Area 48B (per square foot)		\$ 0.39										
16	<b>Encroachment Permit (CMC 90-234)</b>												
	* Exceptions: Fee will not be required of any utility or public agency for utility or public agency for their work done in conjunction with a City construction project												
16.1	<b>Encroachment Permit Issuance and Processing</b>												
16.1.1	Application Processing		\$ 172		\$ 172		130%	\$ 132	100%	756	\$ 130,032	\$ 99,978	\$ 99,978
16.1.2	Filing fee exclusive of processing and inspection fees		\$ 86		\$ 86		130%	\$ 66	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16.2	<b>Encroachment Permit Plan Review, Inspection Fees and Security Deposits</b>												
	* Note: All plan review fees include one initial submission and two revisions. Any additional plan review required will be charged at an hourly rate, and will require an adequate deposit to a trust account prior to commencement. The permit fee includes inspections made during the specified timeline only.												

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity	
No.	Description
16.3	<b>Curb / gutter / sidewalk, not in addition to major construction. (30 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>
16.3.1	Plan Review (if Required)
16.3.2	Inspection fee up to 400 square feet
16.3.3	Each add'l 200 sq ft or fraction thereof
16.3.4	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.
16.4	<b>Driveway (30 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>
16.4.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.4.2	Inspection:
16.4.2.1	Residential
16.4.2.2	Commercial
16.4.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.
16.5	<b>Building Move (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b> *Note: encroachment permit only; other fees may apply
16.5.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.5.2	Inspection:
16.5.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.
16.6	<b>Right-of-way - Obstruction (street/parking space) (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b> private property to accommodate the proposed use. If a permit is granted, such
16.6.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.6.2	Inspection:
16.6.2.1	Parking space obstruction (per calendar day)
16.6.2.2	Dumpster/Drop Storage (if approved)
16.6.2.3	Restoration Security Deposit not required
16.7	<b>Street excavation (steel plates, trenching) (One week from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>
16.7.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.7.2	Inspection:
16.7.2.1	up to 200 sq ft
16.7.2.2	each additional 50 sq ft.
16.7.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.
16.8	<b>Traffic Control (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>
16.8.1	Plan Review (if required)
16.8.2	Inspection:
16.8.2.1	Mobile (temporary set up) - per day
16.8.2.2	Fixed (long-term) - per week

Fee Basis	Cost Recovery Analysis						Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
	Current Fees (2014)			Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
	Ping	Eng	Bldg							
[9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172	\$ 172	36%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 344	\$ 344	114%	\$ 302	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee (Increment)	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 76	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[3.8]	Security Deposit				Security Deposit \$10/ S.F. (\$500 minimum)					
[9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172	\$ 172	36%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 516	\$ 516	171%	\$ 302	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 516	\$ 516	85%	\$ 605	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[3.8]	Security Deposit				Security Deposit \$10/ S.F. (\$500 minimum)					
[9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172	\$ 172	18%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 688	\$ 688	57%	\$ 1,210	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[3.8]	Security Deposit				Security Deposit 100% of Construction Costs					
[9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172	\$ 172	36%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Per Day	\$ 23	\$ 23	30%	\$ 76	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Per Week	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 151	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172	\$ 172	72%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	9%	\$ -	0%	\$ 302	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee (Increment)	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 151	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[3.8]	Security Deposit				Security Deposit 100% of Construction Costs					
[9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172	\$ 172	72%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Per Day	9%	\$ -	0%	\$ 151	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Per Week	9%	\$ -	0%	\$ 454	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis						Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis				
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee	
		Plng	Eng	Bldg								Combined Current Fee
16.8.2.3	Traffic Signal Adjustment - (per day, per intersection)		9%		\$ -	0%	\$ 227	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16.8.3	Restoration Security Deposit not required											
16.9	<b>Sewer lateral in street right-of-way or easement (per lateral) (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b>											
16.9.1	Plan Review (if required)		\$ 172	\$ 172	72%	\$ 238	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16.9.2	Inspections		\$ 688	\$ 688	114%	\$ 605	100%	2	\$ 1,376	\$ 1,210	\$ 1,210	\$ 1,210
16.9.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.					100% of Restoration Cost						
16.10	<b>Sidewalk café (90 days from date of permit issuance to complete)</b> NOTE: also requires encroachment agreement											
16.10.1	Plan Review (if required)		\$ 172	\$ 172	72%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16.10.2	Inspections		\$ 516	\$ 516	114%	\$ 454	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16.10.3	Restoration Security Deposit = 100% cost to restore public right-of-way or watercourse to pre-encroachment condition. Applicant must complete work and request refund of deposit within 30 days from final inspection or 60 days from issuance (whichever is later) or deposit is forfeited.					100% of Restoration Cost						
16.11	<b>Other Inspection Charges</b>											
16.11.1	Reinspection, for reasons such as failure to schedule an inspection, work not ready for a requested inspection, and failed or improper work done without an inspection which must be redone (one hour minimum)		\$ 172	\$ 172	114%	\$ 151	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16.11.2	Special inspection requests, other than regular business hours (2 hour minimum charge)		\$ 172	\$ 172	57%	\$ 302	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16.11.3	Specialty inspection											
16.11.3.1	a. Materials sampling, compaction testing and special materials testing					100%	Cost + Admin Fee	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16.11.3.2	b. Sewer air Test and Televising (per call out)					100%	Cost + Admin Fee	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
17	<b>Environmental Review</b>											
17.1	Staff prepared environmental analysis		\$ 1,450	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 1,622	113%	Deposit \$1,500	7	\$ 11,354	\$ 10,004	\$ 10,004.18
17.2	Consultant prepared environmental analysis		actual cost	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 172	100%	Cost + Admin Fee	7	\$ 96,017.38	\$ 96,017	\$ 96,017.38
17.3	Peer review by consultant		actual cost		\$ -		100%	Cost + Admin Fee	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
17.4	Staff review of consultant-prepared analysis/review		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 857	8	\$ -	\$ 6,858	\$ 6,858.38
17.5	Agency Filing Fees		actual cost				100%	Actual Cost	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
17.6	Document Processing		\$ 50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	19%	\$ 257	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
18	<b>Flood Zone/FEMA/Drainage</b> NOTE: Includes one review and one revision											
18.1	Flood Zone Verification Certificate		\$ 172	\$ 172	130%	\$ 132	100%	1	\$ 172	\$ 132	\$ 132	\$ 132
18.2	Flood Zone Verification Certificate (requiring additional analysis due to location of structure relative to floodplain)		\$ 344	\$ 344	46%	\$ 741	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
18.3	Flood Elevation Certificate		\$ 344	\$ 344	28%	\$ 1,217	100%	3	\$ 1,032	\$ 3,652	\$ 3,652	\$ 3,652
18.4												
18.5	Flood Zone Construction Permit		\$ 172	\$ 172	28%	\$ 609	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
18.6	FEMA application review for LOMA's, CLOMA's, LOMR's, CLOMR's, etc		\$ 860	\$ 860	44%	\$ 1,958	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
18.7	Drainage investigations (per hour)		\$ 172	\$ 172	114%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis						Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis						
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)				Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee		
		Plng	Eng	Bldg	Combined Current Fee									
<b>19 General/Specific Plans</b>														
19.1	Plan Amendment	[9]	Actual Hours	\$ 5,256	\$ 860	\$ -	\$ 6,116	42%	Deposit \$20,000	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
19.2	General Plan/Zoning Ordinance Reimbursement Fee (.0025 x Building Permit Valuation)	[6]	Fixed Fee	.25%					NBS to recalculate					
<b>20 Grading and Erosion Control Permit</b>														
Note: No permit required for grading in an area < 50 cubic yards and not hillside. For more detail and additional exemptions see CMC 16.10.030 (b) and (c).														
<b>20.1 Grading Permit Processing, Administration &amp; Other Fees</b>														
20.1.1	Application Processing		Fixed Fee	\$ 172		\$ 172	130%	\$ 132	100%	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.1.2	Filing fee exclusive of processing and inspection fees	[2]	Fixed Fee	\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 66	100%	45	\$ -	\$ 2,976	\$ 2,976	
20.1.3	Pad certification		Fixed Fee	\$ 86		\$ 86	36%	\$ 238	100%	5	\$ 430	\$ 1,191	\$ 1,191	
20.1.4	Stockpile and erosion control monitoring (per calendar day)		Per Day	\$ 23		\$ 23	61%	\$ 38	100%	2	\$ 46	\$ 76	\$ 76	
20.1.5	Wet Season Work Authorization (October 15 - April 15) - Per Week		Per week	\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 76	100%	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Note: Must obtain approval from inspector prior to commencing grading work during wet weather.														
<b>20.1.6 Refundable Security Deposit for Grading Permits:</b>														
20.1.6.1	Erosion Control Deposit - 100% cost of grading, removal of associated nuisances/hazards, may include installation of erosion & sediment control measures.	[8]	Security Deposit						Security Deposit 100% of Project Cost					
20.1.6.2	See Recycling Program fees and Performance Security Deposit for information on additional construction & demolition security deposit requirements (Section 36).													
<b>20.2 Grading Plan Review</b>														
Note: All plan review fees include one initial submission and two revisions. Any additional plan review required will be charged at an hourly rate, and will require an adequate deposit to a trust account prior to commencement.														
<b>Standard Grading Plan Review Fees:</b>														
20.2.1	Single lot in (a non-hillside) location up to 100 cubic yards	[2]	Fixed Fee	\$ 516		\$ 516	144%	\$ 357	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.2.2	Single lot in (a hillside) location up to 100 cubic yards		Fixed Fee											
20.2.3	101-1,000 cubic yards, for the first 100 cubic yards		Fixed Fee	\$ 688		\$ 688	144%	\$ 476	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.2.4	Plus for each additional 100 cubic yards or fraction thereof		Fixed Fee (Incremental)	\$ 86		\$ 86	72%	\$ 119	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.2.5	1,001-10,000 cubic yards, for the first 1,000 cubic yards		Fixed Fee	\$ 1,548		\$ 1,548	100%	\$ 1,548	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.2.6	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof		Fixed Fee (Incremental)	\$ 172		\$ 172	72%	\$ 238	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.2.7	10,001-100,000 cubic yards, for the first 10,000 cubic yards		Fixed Fee	\$ 3,096		\$ 3,096	84%	\$ 3,692	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.2.8	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof		Fixed Fee (Incremental)	\$ 172		\$ 172	181%	\$ 95	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.2.9	Over 100,000 cubic yards, for first 100,000 cubic yards		Fixed Fee	Actual Cost		\$ -	0%	\$ 12,267	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.2.10	Plus each additional 10,000 cu yds		Fixed Fee (Incremental)	\$ 172		\$ 172	241%	\$ 71	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.2.11	Additional plan review beyond two revisions (see note)	[9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172		\$ 172	72%	Hourly	100%					
<b>Special Grading Plan Review Fees:</b>														
20.3	New Pool - Plan Review													
20.3.1.1	< 100 cubic yards	[2]	Fixed Fee	\$ 172		\$ 172	36%	\$ 476	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.3.1.2	100 -200 cubic yards	[2]	Fixed Fee	\$ 172		\$ 172	24%	\$ 715	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.4	Additional document review, including SWPPP's and Soils report													
20.4.1	Geotechnical	[2,9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172		\$ 172	72%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.4.2	SWPPP	[2,9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172		\$ 172	72%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20.4.3	Mylar Maps and Plans Security Deposit: \$200/page OR Minimum: \$500 (Plans)	[2,8]	Security Deposit						Security Deposit \$200/ page (\$500 minimum)					

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis					Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis					
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Combined Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
		Ping	Eng	Bldg								
20.5	<b>Grading Permit Inspection</b>											
	Note: The permit fee includes inspections made during the specified timeline only.											
	1,000 cubic yards: 30 days from date of permit											
	up to 10,000 cubic yards; 60 days from date of permit											
	100,000 cubic yards: 90 days from date of permit											
	yards: 120 days from date of permit											
20.5.1	Single lot in (a non-hillside) location up to 100 cubic yards											
20.5.2	Single lot in (a hillside) location up to 100 cubic yards											
20.5.3	101-1,000 cubic yards, for the first 100 cubic yards											
20.5.4	Plus for each additional 100 cubic yards or fraction thereof											
20.5.5	1,001-10,000 cubic yards, for the first 1,000 cubic yards											
20.5.6	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof											
20.5.7	10,001-100,000 cubic yards, for the first 10,000 cubic yards											
20.5.8	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof											
20.5.9	Over 100,000 cubic yards, for the first 100,000 cubic yards											
20.5.10	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof											
20.6	<b>Special Grading Permit Inspection Fees:</b>											
20.6.1	New Pool - Inspection											
20.6.1.1	< 100 cubic yards											
20.6.1.2	100 -200 cubic yards											
20.6.2	Pool Demolition - Inspection											
20.6.2.1	< 100 cubic yards											
20.6.2.2	100 -200 cubic yards											
21	<b>Hillside Protection</b>											
21.1	Hillside Protection											
	Minor - SFR - 1 lot											
21.2	Major - Res - > 1 lot; Non-Res											
	Hillside Protection Extension											
22	<b>Historic Preservation</b>											
22.1	Certificate of Appropriateness											
22.2	Amendment to Certification of Appropriateness											
22.3	Designation/Termination of Landmark Designation											
23	<b>IMPROVEMENTS (Major)</b>											
23.1	<b>Permit Processing, Administration &amp; Other Fees</b>											
23.1.1	Pre-Engineering (For initial meeting)											
23.1.2	Pre-Engineering Traffic Review											
23.1.3	Application Processing											
23.1.4	Filing fee exclusive of processing and inspection fees											
23.2	<b>Improvement Plan Review *</b>											
	* Include initial submission and two revisions											
23.2.1	Base Cost (Improvements cost ≤ \$100,000, plus cost per \$5K increment)											
23.2.2	per each addtl \$5,000 increment, or fraction thereof											
23.2.3	Base Cost (improvement cost \$100,001 - \$500,000, plus cost per \$5K increment)											
23.2.4	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$100,000, or fraction thereof											
23.2.5	Base Cost (Improvement cost > \$500,001, plus cost per \$5K increment)											
23.2.6	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$500,000, or fraction thereof											

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis						Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis						
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee			
		Plng	Eng	Bldg								Combined Current Fee		
23.2.7	Plan Re-Check (hourly)	[2.9]	Actual Hours		\$ -		\$ -	0%	Hourly	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23.3	<b>Improvement Inspection **</b> ** Note: The permit fee includes inspections made during the specified timeline only.													
23.3.1	Base Cost - Improvements ≤ \$100,000, plus cost per \$5K increment or less (30 days to complete). See Note**.	[2]	Fixed Fee		9%	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 302	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23.3.2	per each addtl \$5,000 increment, or fraction thereof	[2]	Fixed Fee (Increment)		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 302	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23.3.3	Base Cost - improvement cost \$100,001 - \$500,000, plus cost per \$5K increment (90 days to complete) See Note**.	[2]	Fixed Fee		9%	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 6,350	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23.3.4	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$100,000, or fraction thereof	[2]	Fixed Fee (Increment)		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 227	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23.3.5	Base Cost - Improvement cost > \$500,001, plus cost of \$5K increment (180 days to complete) See Note**.	[2]	Fixed Fee		9%	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 24,493	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23.3.6	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$500,000, or fraction thereof	[2]	Fixed Fee (Increment)		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 151	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23.3.7	C.3 service fee for permits increasing impervious surface (percent of valuation)	[3]	Valuation-Based		.12%				.12%					
23.4	<b>Security Deposits and Bond Requirements</b> Note: Additional requirements may be identified in the Conditions of Approval for each project													
23.4.1	Mylar Maps and Plans Security Deposit: \$200/page, minimum of \$500 (to guarantee submission/return of final maps/plans to City)	[3.8]	Security Deposit						Security Deposit of \$200/page; \$500 minimum					
23.4.2	Improvement Security Deposit/Bond (if required) 110% of construction costs + 100% contractor/subcontractors/labor & material costs	[3.8]	Bond or Security Deposit						Security Deposit 110% of Construction Costs					
23.4.3	Performance Bond (if required) 110% of construction costs	[3.8]	Bond or Security Deposit						Security Deposit 110% of Construction Costs					
23.4.4	Fee associated with calling a bond (if required); to be funded from bond proceeds	[9]	Actual Hours						Actual Cost					
23.4.5	See Recycling Program fees and Performance Security Deposit for information on additional Construction & Demolition security deposit requirements	[3.8]	Security Deposit						See Recycling Program fees					
24	<b>Inclusionary Housing (Placeholder for MFS; Not included in cost analysis)</b>	[3]				\$ -	\$ -							
24.1	In-lieu Fee per market-rate housing unit					\$ -	\$ -							
24.1.1	Rental (per unit)					\$ -	\$ -							
24.1.2	Ownership (per unit)					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,043	\$ 5,043					
24.2	Compliance Monitoring					\$ -	\$ -							
24.2.1	Rental (annual)					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38	\$ 38					
24.2.2	Ownership (per change of ownership)					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 262	\$ 262					
25	<b>Map Reviews</b>													
25.1	<b>Tentative Maps</b>													
25.1.1	Tentative Parcel Map Review (also known as a Tentative Minor Subdivision Map)		Fixed Fee	\$ 4,380	\$ 1,720	\$ 6,100		256%	\$ 2,382	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			Fixed Fee (Incremental)	\$ 292	\$ 172	\$ 464		195%	\$ 238	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25.1.2	Plus per lot													
25.1.3	Amendment to Minor Subdivision		Fixed Fee	\$ 730	\$ 516	\$ 1,246		174%	\$ 715	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25.1.4	Extension to Minor Subdivision		Fixed Fee	\$ 438	\$ 344	\$ 782		164%	\$ 476	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25.1.5	Tentative Major Subdivision Map Review (Also known as a Tract Map)		Fixed Fee	\$ 7,300	\$ 2,752	\$ 10,052		264%	\$ 3,811	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			Fixed Fee (Incremental)	\$ 292	\$ 172	\$ 464		195%	\$ 238	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25.1.6	Plus Per Lot													
25.1.7	Amendment to Major Subdivision		Fixed Fee	\$ 2,044	\$ 1,032	\$ 3,076		63%	\$ 4,858	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25.1.8	Extension to Major Subdivision		Fixed Fee	\$ 733	\$ 344	\$ 1,077		93%	\$ 1,162	100%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity	
No.	Description
25.2	<b>Parcel Maps (Minor Subdivision Maps) - recorded map process</b>
25.2.1	Parcel Map processing fees
25.2.2	Parcel Map review
25.2.3	Plus Per Lot
25.2.4	Parcel Map Filing
25.2.5	Mylar Maps and Plans Security Deposit: \$200/page OR Minimum: \$500 (Parcel Map) and \$1,000 (Final Map)
25.3	<b>Final Maps (Major Subdivision or Tract Maps)</b>
25.3.1	Final Map processing fees
25.3.2	Final Map Review
25.3.3	Per Lot
25.3.4	Map Re-review
25.3.5	Final Map Filing
25.3.6	Mylar Maps and Plans Security Deposit: \$200/page OR Minimum: \$500 (Parcel Map) and \$1,000 (Final Map)
25.4	<b>Agreements</b>
25.4.1	Subdivision Agreement
25.4.2	Amendment to Subdivision Agreement
25.4.3	Improvement Agreement
25.4.4	Amendment of Improvement Agreement (Minor Subdivisions)
25.5	<b>Other Map Changes</b>
25.5.1	Special engineering analysis
25.5.2	Charge for Filing of New Street Monuments (each)
25.5.3	Charge for new lot creation (per lot)
25.5.4	Lot line adjustment (between 2 parcels)
25.5.5	Each additional parcel
25.5.6	Parcel merge (between 2 parcels)
25.5.7	Each additional parcel
25.5.8	Certificate of Compliance
25.5.9	Certification of Correction Review
25.5.10	Update of City Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drain Base Maps
25.5.10.1	Minor Subdivision
25.5.10.2	Major Subdivision
25.6	<b>Easement, Dedication, Vacation, Abandonment</b>
25.6.1	Application for vacation or abandonment of property rights
25.6.2	Acceptance of easements and dedications
25.6.2.1	Acceptance by City Council
25.6.2.2	Acceptance by City Staff
25.6.3	Reversion to acreage or record of survey filing fee
25.6.4	Assessment District Reapportionment (CMC 78-32)
25.6.4.1	Application Fee
25.6.4.2	Review - Hearing Method
25.6.4.3	Review - Alternative Method
25.7	Development Plan Review and additional plan checking as required, due to substantial plan alterations
26	<b>Neighborhood Preservation</b>
26.1	Reinspection Fee
26.2	Extension Fee
26.3	Graffiti and Summary Abatement

Fee Basis	Cost Recovery Analysis						Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis				
	Current Fees (2014)			Combined Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
	Ping	Eng	Bldg								
[2]	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 198	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 1,720		\$ 1,720	48%	\$ 3,573	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[8]	Fixed Fee (Incremental)	\$ 172		\$ 172	72%	\$ 238	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 1,720		\$ 1,720	72%	\$ 2,382	100%	1	\$ 1,720	\$ 2,382	\$ 2,382
[8]	Security Deposit					Security Deposit \$200/ page or \$500 Minimum					
[2]	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 198	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 2,752		\$ 2,752	58%	\$ 4,764	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[2]	Fixed Fee (Incremental)	\$ 172		\$ 172	72%	\$ 238	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 1,085	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[8]	Fixed Fee	\$ 1,720		\$ 1,720	72%	\$ 2,382	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Security Deposit					Security Deposit \$200/ page or \$500 Minimum					
[2]	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 7,410	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 3,440		\$ 3,440	68%	\$ 5,028	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[2]	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 7,410	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 860		\$ 860	17%	\$ 5,028	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[10]	Cost + Admin Fee	\$ -	Actual Cost	\$ -	100%	Cost + Admin Fee	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 344	\$ -	130%	\$ 264	100%	1	\$ 344	\$ 264	\$ 264
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 344	\$ -	72%	\$ 476	100%	2	\$ 688	\$ 953	\$ 953
	Fixed Fee	\$ 876	\$ 860	\$ 172	114%	\$ 1,673	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 172	\$ -	72%	\$ 238	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 876	\$ 860	\$ -	113%	\$ 1,534	100%	1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 172	\$ -	72%	\$ 238	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 860	\$ -	72%	\$ 1,191	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 860	\$ -	72%	\$ 1,191	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 344	\$ -	72%	\$ 476	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 688	\$ -	72%	\$ 953	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ 584	\$ 1,032	\$ -	51%	\$ 3,144	100%	1	\$ 1,616	\$ 3,144	\$ 3,144
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 1,720	\$ -	72%	\$ 2,382	100%	1	\$ 1,720	\$ 2,382	\$ 2,382
Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 860	\$ -	72%	\$ 1,191	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 516	\$ -	72%	\$ 715	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 86	\$ -	36%	\$ 238	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 10,320	\$ -	72%	\$ 14,292	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ 516	\$ -	72%	\$ 715	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
[9]	Actual Hours	\$ 172		\$ 172	24%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[2]	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 183	150%	\$ 122	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 87	63%	\$ 139	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[2]	Actual Hours or Cost + Admin Fee	\$ -	\$ -	Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost or Cost + Admin Fee	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis					Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis					
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Combined Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
		Ping	Eng	Bldg								
26.4	Public Nuisance Administrative Fines (Per Government Code Sections 53069.4, 25132(b), and 36900(b))				\$ -							\$ -
	First issuance in 12 months	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 100							\$ -
	Second issuance in 12 months	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 200							\$ -
	Third and subsequent issuance in 12 months	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 500							\$ -
26.5	Annual Multiple Family Rental Dwelling Unit Inspection and Maintenance Fee (per unit)				\$ -							\$ -
	Failure to pay fee after due date	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 49	\$ 49							\$ -
	31 - 60 days after due date, percent of initial fee	\$ -	\$ -	20%	\$ -							\$ -
	61 - 90 days after due date, percent of initial fee	\$ -	\$ -	40%	\$ -							\$ -
	90 days or more after due date, percent of initial fee	\$ -	\$ -	50%	\$ -							\$ -
	Application fee for self certification	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 65	\$ 65							\$ -
26.6	Building and Safety Code Violations (Per Government Code Sections 53069.4, 25132(c), and 36900(c))				\$ -							\$ -
	First issuance in 12 months	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 100							\$ -
	Second issuance in 12 months	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 500							\$ -
	Third and subsequent issuance in 12 months	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000							\$ -
26.7	Confiscated Signs (CMC 122-1029)				\$ -							\$ -
	First violation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30	\$ 30							\$ -
	Second violation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40	\$ 40							\$ -
	Third violation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40	\$ 40							\$ -
	Plus Citation	\$ -	\$ -	See 27.d	\$ -							\$ -
	Plus Reinspection Fee	\$ -	\$ -	See 27.a	\$ -							\$ -
26.8	Request for Exemption for Small Collection Facilities for Nonprofit Organizations (CMC 82-113)				\$ -							\$ -
	Fixed Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ 250	98%	\$ 255	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
27	Off-Site Street Improvement Program (OSIP) (CMC 78-154)				\$ -							\$ -
27.1	Single family unit (per dwelling unit)			\$ 3,251	\$ 3,251							\$ -
	Secondary living unit			\$ 1,626	\$ 1,626							\$ -
27.2	Multi family unit, including condominium and townhouse (per dwelling unit)			\$ 2,624	\$ 2,624							\$ -
27.3	Commercial (per gross sq. ft.)			\$ 8.81	\$ 9							\$ -
27.4	Office (per gross sq. ft.)			\$ 7.04	\$ 7							\$ -
27.5	Industrial (per gross sq. ft.)			\$ 2.98	\$ 3							\$ -
27.6	Mini-storage (per gross sq. ft.)			\$ 1.51	\$ 2							\$ -
28	Other Community Development Fees				\$ -							\$ -
28.1	Abatement Hearing (by the Zoning Administrator)				\$ 292	21%	\$ 1,372	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
28.2	Street Name Change				\$ 438	32%	\$ 1,372	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
28.2.1	Ping (included 8 hrs for IT and coord with PD, Fire)	\$ 438	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 438							\$ -
28.3	Continuance of Hearing Item				\$ 438	32%	\$ 1,372	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
28.3.1	Continuance by Applicant	\$ 438	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 438							\$ -
28.3.2	Republication and renofication	\$ 219	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 219	100%	cost of publication	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
29	Oversized Load Permit				\$ -							\$ -
29.1	A single day vehicle movement				\$ 16	1%	\$ 16	1%	160	\$ 2,560	\$ 2,560	\$ 2,560
29.2	Multiple movements of a vehicle for a one-year period (special conditions may apply)				\$ 90	6%	\$ 90	6%	36	\$ 3,240	\$ 3,240	\$ 3,240
30	Park Land (Placeholder only; not included in analysis)				\$ -							\$ -
30.1	Rural Residential-Conservation/Low-Density Residential Designations; Park Land Requirement - 697 sq. ft. (per unit)				\$ -							\$ -
	9/1/06			\$ 11,910	\$ 11,910							\$ -
	9/1/07			\$ 13,504	\$ 13,504							\$ -
	9/1/08			\$ 15,098	\$ 15,098							\$ -
	9/1/09			\$ 16,691	\$ 16,691							\$ -
30.2	Medium-Density Designation; Park Land Requirement - 479 sq. ft.				\$ -							\$ -
	9/1/06			\$ -	\$ -							\$ -
	9/1/07			\$ 8,170	\$ 8,170							\$ -
	9/1/08			\$ 9,271	\$ 9,271							\$ -
	9/1/09			\$ 10,370	\$ 10,370							\$ -
				\$ 11,470	\$ 11,470							\$ -
30.3	High-Density Designation; Park Land Requirement - 414 sq. ft. (per unit)				\$ -							\$ -
	9/1/06			\$ 7,055	\$ 7,055							\$ -
	9/1/07			\$ 8,009	\$ 8,009							\$ -
	9/1/08			\$ 8,962	\$ 8,962							\$ -

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis					Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis						
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Combined Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee	
		Ping	Eng	Bldg									
30.4	Downtown, Seniors and Special Needs Housing Units; Park Land Requirement - 305 sq. ft. (per unit)		\$ 9,914		\$ 9,914								
					\$ -								
			\$ 5,233		\$ 5,233								
			\$ 5,924		\$ 5,924								
			\$ 6,613		\$ 6,613								
			\$ 7,304		\$ 7,304								
30.5	Fee for Secondary Unit - shall be fifty percent (50%) of the Rural Residential-Conservation/Low Density Residential Designation (per unit)				\$ -								
					\$ -								
			\$ 5,955		\$ 5,955								
			\$ 6,752		\$ 6,752								
			\$ 7,548		\$ 7,548								
			\$ 8,345		\$ 8,345								
31	<b>Parking, In-Lieu Payment</b> (not included in cost analysis; placeholder for MFS) Per off street parking space that a development is deficient												
			\$ 1,572	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,572							
32	<b>Preliminary Application</b>												
		Fixed Fee	\$ 1,168	\$ 1,376	\$ -	\$ 2,544	78%	\$ 3,277	100%	3	\$ 7,632	\$ 9,832	\$ 9,832
33	<b>Public Notification</b> Preparation and mailing of public notification to property owners and occupants												
		Fixed Fee	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250	18%	\$ 1,372	100%	1	\$ 250	\$ 1,372	\$ 1,372
34	<b>Public Support</b>												
34.1	Research, per hour after first 30 minutes	Actual Hours	\$ 146	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 318	105%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
34.2	Consultation, per hour after first 30 minutes	Actual Hours	\$ 146	\$ 172	\$ -	\$ 318	105%	Hourly	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
35	<b>Recycling - Construction &amp; Demolition Projects</b>												
35.1	Program Fee (CMC 82-120) - Percentage assessed to the permit value of covered projects (CMC 18-116). This fee is capped at \$4,500 and \$18,000 for residential and commercial projects, respectively. This fee is non-refundable.		\$ -	3%	3%	\$ -							
						\$ -							
						\$ -							
35.2	Request for Exemption for Small Collection Facilities for Nonprofit Organizations (CMC 82-113).		\$ -	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ 250							
35.3	Performance Security Fee (CMC 82-118) - Percentage assessed to the permit value of covered projects (CMC 18-116). The minimum fee is \$250 for projects under \$10,000 in value and \$500 for projects \$10,000 in value, or greater. The maximum fee is capped at \$25,000.					\$ -							
						\$ -							
			\$ -	1.5%	1.5%	\$ -							
			\$ -	2%	2%	\$ -							
						\$ -							
36	<b>Sewer Connection</b>												
36.1	Application Processing Fee (1-hour minimum) (per hour)					\$ -							
36.2	Connection Fee					\$ -							
			\$ 172		\$ 172								
						\$ -							
			\$ 5,043		\$ 5,043								
			\$ 3,731		\$ 3,731								
			\$ 2,774		\$ 2,774								
			\$ 2,774		\$ 2,774								
			\$ 1,009		\$ 1,009								
			Determined		\$ -								
			Determined		\$ -								
36.3	Lateral Construction Area Main Trunk reimbursement Fees					\$ -							
			Determined		\$ -								
			Determined		\$ -								
			Determined		\$ -								
			Determined		\$ -								
			Determined		\$ -								
			Determined		\$ -								
36.4	All other uses (per fixture) Certificate of Entitlement Reimbursement Fee (CMC Article II, Section 110-40)					\$ 175							
						\$ 175							

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis						Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
		Plng	Eng	Bldg							
36.5	Sewer Service charge (annual)		Table 4, pg D-54		\$ -						
37	Sidewalk Repair Administrative Fee (Sections 5600 et seq. of the CA Streets & Highways Code)	na	\$ 172	na	\$ 172	114%	\$ 151	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
38	Special Administration										
38.1	Agreement processing not related to subdivisions										
38.1.1	Council action not required		\$ 1,548		\$ 1,548	81%	\$ 1,906	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
38.1.2	Council action required		\$ 1,548		\$ 1,548	41%	\$ 3,811	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
38.2	Acceptance of new public improvements		\$ 860		\$ 860	45%	\$ 1,906	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
38.3	After-hours permit request review/approval		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 66	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
38.4	Permit extension request		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 132	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
38.5	Project archiving and closeout (major projects only)		\$ 172		\$ 172	16%	Deposit \$1,500	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
38.6	Penalties										
38.6.1	Penalty for commencing work without permit (note: repeat offenders will be subject to increasing penalties at the discretion of the City Engineer)						2X Permit Fee				
38.6.2	Penalty for work done without scheduling the required inspection (note: repeat offenders will be subject to increasing penalties at the discretion of the City Engineer)						1 additional hour charged per incident				
39	Storm Water Treatment Controls										
39.1	Permit Processing, Administration & Other Fees										
39.1.1	Pre-Engineering (For initial meeting)		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 476	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.1.2	Application processing		\$ 172		\$ 172	130%	\$ 132	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.1.3	Filing fee exclusive of processing and inspection fees		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 66	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.2	Storm Water Treatment Controls Plan Review *										
	* Include initial submission and two revisions										
39.2.1	Base Cost (Improvements cost ≤ \$100,000, plus cost per \$5K increment)		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 238	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.2.2	per each addtl \$5,000 increment, or fraction thereof		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 238	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.2.3	Base Cost (improvement cost \$100,001 - \$500,000, plus cost per \$5K increment)		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 5,002	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.2.4	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$100,000, or fraction thereof		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 179	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.2.5	Base Cost (Improvement cost > \$500,001, plus cost per \$5K increment)		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 19,294	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.2.6	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$500,000, or fraction thereof		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 119	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.2.7	Plan Re-Check (hourly)		\$ -		\$ -	100%	Hourly	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.3	Storm Water Treatment Controls										
39.3.1	Base Improvement cost ≤ \$100,000, plus cost of \$5K increment		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 302	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.3.2	per each addtl \$5,000 increment, or fraction thereof		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 302	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.3.3	Base Improvement cost \$100,001 - \$500,000, plus cost of \$5K increment		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 6,350	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.3.4	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$100,000, or fraction thereof		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 227	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.3.5	Improvement cost > \$500,001, plus cost of \$5K increment		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 24,493	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.3.6	per each addtl \$5,000 increment more than \$500,000, or fraction thereof		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 151	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.3.7	Review of Operations & Maintenance Agreement		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 1,512	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
39.3.8	Annual Inspection of Stormwater Treatment Control		\$ -		\$ -	0%	\$ 302	100%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis							Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Combined Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
		Plng	Eng	Bldg								
40	TERPS (Terminal Instrument Procedures Study)	Actual cost + 20% admin fee					Cost + Admin Fee		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
41	<b>Tree Preservation &amp; Protection</b>											
41.1	Heritage Tree Designation	Fixed Fee \$ 193	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 193	14%	\$ 1,372	100%	1	\$ 193	\$ 1,372	\$ 1,372
41.2	Tree Removal	Actual Hours \$ 968	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 968	141%	Deposit \$1,500	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42	<b>Use Permit</b>											
42.1	Minor Use Permit											
42.1.1	Existing building without hearing	Fixed Fee \$ 1,314	\$ 688	\$ 172	\$ 2,174	138%	\$ 1,575	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.1.2	Existing building with hearing	Fixed Fee \$ 1,314	\$ 688	\$ 172	\$ 2,174	101%	\$ 2,156	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.1.3	New Construction without hearing	Fixed Fee \$ 1,314	\$ 688	\$ 172	\$ 2,174	69%	\$ 3,149	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.1.4	New Construction with hearing	Fixed Fee \$ 1,314	\$ 688	\$ 172	\$ 2,174	42%	\$ 5,236	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.2	Large Family Day Care Home	Fixed Fee \$ 730	\$ 468	\$ 172	\$ 1,370	51%	\$ 2,687	100%	3	\$ 4,110	\$ 8,062	\$ 8,062
42.3	Home Based Business - Visiting Clientele	Fixed Fee \$ 469	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 469	68%	\$ 686	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.4	Wireless Communications Facilities	Fixed Fee \$ 2,482	\$ 1,032	\$ 86	\$ 3,600	54%	\$ 6,642	100%	5	\$ 18,000	\$ 33,212	\$ 33,212
42.5	Minor Use Permit Amendment											
42.5.1	With hearing	Fixed Fee \$ 483	\$ 172	\$ 86	\$ 741	75%	\$ 994	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.5.2	Without hearing	Fixed Fee \$ 483	\$ 172	\$ 86	\$ 741	114%	\$ 651	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.6	Minor Use Permit Extension											
42.6.1	With hearing	Fixed Fee \$ 387	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 387	56%	\$ 686	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.6.2	Without hearing	Fixed Fee \$ 387	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 387	113%	\$ 343	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.7	Major Use Permit											
42.7.1	Existing Building	Actual Hours \$ 1,314	\$ 344	\$ 172	\$ 1,830	79%	Deposit \$3,000	100%	6	\$ 10,980	\$ 13,980	\$ 13,980
42.7.2	New Construction	Actual Hours \$ 5,110	\$ 3,440	\$ 258	\$ 8,808	129%	Deposit \$10,000	100%	2	\$ 17,616	\$ 13,615	\$ 13,615
42.8	Variance											
42.8.1	Residential variance	Fixed Fee \$ 1,460	\$ 344	\$ 86	\$ 1,890	99%	\$ 1,918	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.8.2	Variance (non-residential)	Actual Hours \$ 2,920	\$ 344	\$ 172	\$ 3,436	136%	Deposit \$3,000	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.8.3	Reasonable Accommodation	Fixed Fee \$ 146	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 146	21%	\$ 686	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
42.8.4	Variance Extension	Fixed Fee \$ 438	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 438	64%	\$ 686	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
43	<b>Zoning Amendment</b>											
43.1	Rezoning Application	Actual Hours \$ 6,588	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,588	48%	Deposit \$20,000	100%	1	\$ 6,588	\$ 13,717	\$ 13,717
43.2	Zoning Text Amendment	Actual Hours \$ 6,588	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,588	48%	Deposit \$20,000	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
44	<b>Zoning Verification Letter</b>											
		Fixed Fee \$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ 429	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>OTHER FEES:</b>												
45	Refund processing fee (for overpayments < \$15 - see notes section)	Fixed Fee					\$ 15					
46	Deposit forfeiture (security deposits or trust accounts left unclaimed after 4 years - see notes section)	Unclaimed Deposit										

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity		Cost Recovery Analysis					Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis					
No.	Description	Current Fees (2014)			Combined Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
		Plng	Eng	Bldg								
<b>HOURLY RATE WITH OVERHEAD</b>												
47	Planning Services	[9]	\$ 146				\$ 171					
48	Expedited Planning Services - performed by consultant	[1,10]					Cost + Admin Fee					
<b>Engineering Services</b>												
49.1	Processing	[9]	\$ 172				\$ 132					
49.2	Engineering Plan Check	[9]	\$ 172				\$ 238					
49.3	Engineering Inspection	[9]	\$ 172				\$ 151					
<b>Building Services</b>												
50.1	Processing	[9]		\$ -			\$ 85					
50.2	Plan Check	[9]		\$ 172			\$ 139					
50.3	Inspection	[9]		\$ 109			\$ 122					
	For services requested of City staff which have no fee listed in this fee schedule, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the established hourly rates for this division. Additionally, the City will pass-through to the applicant any discrete costs incurred from the use of external service providers if required to process the specific application, including an administrative fee of 20% to cover the associated Citywide overhead costs.											
<b>TOTAL CED DEPARTMENT</b>												

- Notes**
- [1] Calculation per Building Cost of Service Analysis (COS)
  - [2] New Fee / Significantly Modified Fee Structure
  - [3] Placeholder for Master Fee Schedule (MFS); Not included in cost analysis
  - [4] Current Fee listed is for Planning only
  - [5] Recommended policy for combination projects is to collect the deposit for each application as if it is a stand alone application; it is more efficient and cost effective to refund money; see Trust Account Deposit footnotes below (9 and 10)
  - [6] General Plan fee - separate calculation
  - [7] Fee set by State maximum
  - [8] **Security Deposits** are required in an amount equal to the expected cost of restoring City property, public infrastructure or right-of-way to its original condition. Security deposits (otherwise refundable) may be applied by the City to any unpaid fees, hourly charges, or other costs associated with the project, after construction or other pledged purposes have been met. Applicants must request refunds of security deposits within 30 days of acceptance by the City or 30 days of permit finalization (unless otherwise stated in the Master Fee Schedule.) Any deposits unclaimed after four years from the date of the deposit will be forfeited.
  - [9] **Trust Account Deposit Required.** Fees billed on an hourly basis require an upfront deposit of estimated fees (see "Trust Account Information" below); the totals provided on this line item represent the required minimum deposit. The Chief Building Official, City Engineer, Planning Manager or Economic Development Manager may adjust the required minimum deposit based on the project parameters and any additional information they may have.
  - [10] **Trust Account Deposit Required.** All outside consultant costs required for the project are billed at actual cost plus 20% administrative costs; a deposit to a trust account is required prior to any work commencing, and will be calculated based upon the consultant's estimate (including any contingency amount) plus 20%. Funds will be drawn down from the applicant's trust account as needed to pay the actual invoices and associated 20% admin fee on amounts paid.

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

Fee Activity	
No.	Description
[11]	<b>Security Deposit Information (Refundable)</b> In instances where the proposed permitted work may result in damage to public right of ways or property, security deposits are generally required. Unless otherwise stated in the Master Fee Schedule or Conditions of Approval, requests for refund of security deposits must be submitted to the City within 30 days of acceptance or permit finalization. All unclaimed deposits are automatically forfeited four years from the date of the deposit.
[12]	<b>Trust Account Information</b> In instances where fees are billed based on actual hours spent, or where a deposit to a trust account is required in order to fund outside costs, a trust account is required to be funded by applicant. Funds will be drawn down from the applicant's trust account as needed to pay the actual hours, outside costs and associated 20% administrative fees. Refunds of unused trust account balances will be provided upon request; any amounts remaining in an inactive trust account will be forfeited by the depositor and/or applicant (if the remaining balance is \$15 or less, account will be considered inactive after one year from date of last transaction, all others will be considered inactive after four years from date of last transaction.)
[13]	<b>Overpayment Information</b> Any permit overpayment made by check of \$15 or more will be processed for refund by check. Such refunds may take up to three weeks. Any permit overpayment made by check less than \$15 will be forfeited by the applicant, as the cost to the City of processing such refunds exceeds the refund amount. Overpayments made by credit card follow the same guidelines unless the charge can be voided and correctly processed.
[14]	<b>See Admin Fees</b> - Consistent with Admin Fees

Fee Basis	Cost Recovery Analysis					Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis				
	Current Fees (2014)			Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
Ping	Eng	Bldg	Combined Current Fee							

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Activity	Unit	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
			Estimated Average Labor Time Per Unit (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>A. Building Permit</b>		[9]							
<b>Valuation-Based Inspection Fees</b>		[1]							
1. \$1 - \$2,000	Fixed Fee		0.75	\$ 122	\$ 91	n/a	n/a	\$ 91	100%
2. \$2,001 - \$25,000	Base Cost (For the first \$2,000)		0.75	\$ 122	\$ 91	n/a	n/a	\$ 91	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.10	\$ 122	\$ 12	n/a	n/a	\$ 12	100%
3. \$25,001 - \$50,000	Base Cost (For the first \$25,000)		3.00	\$ 122	\$ 365	n/a	n/a	\$ 365	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.12	\$ 122	\$ 15	n/a	n/a	\$ 15	100%
4. \$50,001 - \$100,000	Base Cost (For the first \$50,000)		6.00	\$ 122	\$ 730	n/a	n/a	\$ 730	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.16	\$ 122	\$ 20	n/a	n/a	\$ 20	100%
5. \$100,001 - \$500,000	Base Cost (For the first \$100,000)		14.08	\$ 122	\$ 1,713	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,713	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.13	\$ 122	\$ 16	n/a	n/a	\$ 16	100%
6. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	Base Cost (For the first \$500,000)		67.50	\$ 122	\$ 8,211	n/a	n/a	\$ 8,211	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.14	\$ 122	\$ 17	n/a	n/a	\$ 17	100%
7. \$1,000,001 and up	Base Cost (For the first \$1,000,000)		138.00	\$ 122	\$ 16,786	n/a	n/a	\$ 16,786	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.05	\$ 122	\$ 6	n/a	n/a	\$ 6	100%
			1,137.50	\$ 122	\$ 138,363			\$ 138,363	100%

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Activity	Unit	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
			Estimated Average Labor Time Per Unit (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>Valuation-Based Plan Review Fees</b>			[2]						
1. \$1 - \$2,000	Flat Fee		0.47	\$ 139	\$ 65	n/a	n/a	\$ 65	100%
2. \$2,001 - \$25,000	Base Cost (For the first \$2,000)		0.47	\$ 139	\$ 65	n/a	n/a	\$ 65	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.06	\$ 139	\$ 8	n/a	n/a	\$ 8	100%
3. \$25,001 - \$50,000	Base Cost (For the first \$25,000)		1.75	\$ 139	\$ 243	n/a	n/a	\$ 243	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.13	\$ 139	\$ 19	n/a	n/a	\$ 19	100%
4. \$50,001 - \$100,000	Base Cost (For the first \$50,000)		5.08	\$ 139	\$ 706	n/a	n/a	\$ 706	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.11	\$ 139	\$ 15	n/a	n/a	\$ 15	100%
5. \$100,001 - \$500,000	Base Cost (For the first \$100,000)		10.33	\$ 139	\$ 1,436	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,436	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.08	\$ 139	\$ 11	n/a	n/a	\$ 11	100%
6. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	Base Cost (For the first \$500,000)		41.00	\$ 139	\$ 5,697	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,697	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.06	\$ 139	\$ 9	n/a	n/a	\$ 9	100%
7. \$1,000,001 and up	Base Cost (For the first \$1,000,000)		71.67	\$ 139	\$ 9,958	n/a	n/a	\$ 9,958	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.01	\$ 139	\$ 1	n/a	n/a	\$ 1	100%
			220.00	\$ 139	\$ 30,568			\$ 30,568	100%

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Activity	Unit	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
			Estimated Average Labor Time Per Unit (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>Miscellaneous Plumbing, Electrical and Mechanical Plan Review</b>									
		[3,9]							
1. \$1 - \$2,000 -Over the Counter	Fixed Fee		0.32	\$ 139	\$ 44	n/a	n/a	\$ 44	100%
2. \$2,001 - \$25,000	Base Cost (For the first \$2,000)		0.32	\$ 139	\$ 44	n/a	n/a	\$ 44	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.02	\$ 139	\$ 3	n/a	n/a	\$ 3	100%
3. \$25,001 - \$50,000	Base Cost (For the first \$25,000)		0.83	\$ 139	\$ 116	n/a	n/a	\$ 116	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.07	\$ 139	\$ 10	n/a	n/a	\$ 10	100%
4. \$50,001 - \$100,000	Base Cost (For the first \$50,000)		2.58	\$ 139	\$ 359	n/a	n/a	\$ 359	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.06	\$ 139	\$ 8	n/a	n/a	\$ 8	100%
5. \$100,001 - \$500,000	Base Cost (For the first \$100,000)		5.50	\$ 139	\$ 764	n/a	n/a	\$ 764	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.03	\$ 139	\$ 4	n/a	n/a	\$ 4	100%
6. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	Base Cost (For the first \$500,000)		15.83	\$ 139	\$ 2,200	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,200	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.03	\$ 139	\$ 4	n/a	n/a	\$ 4	100%
7. \$1,000,001 and up	Base Cost (For the first \$1,000,000)		31.33	\$ 139	\$ 4,354	n/a	n/a	\$ 4,354	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.00	\$ 139	\$ 1	n/a	n/a	\$ 1	100%
			102.00	\$ 139	\$ 14,173	n/a	n/a		

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Activity	Unit	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
			Estimated Average Labor Time Per Unit (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>Miscellaneous Plumbing, Electrical and Mechanical Permit / Inspection</b>		[4,9]							
1. \$1 - \$2,000	Fixed Fee		0.83	\$ 122	\$ 101	n/a	n/a	\$ 101	100%
2. \$5,001 - \$25,000	Base Cost (For the first \$2,000)		0.83	\$ 122	\$ 101	n/a	n/a	\$ 101	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.04	\$ 122	\$ 5	n/a	n/a	\$ 5	100%
3. \$25,001 - \$50,000	Base Cost (For the first \$25,000)		1.75	\$ 122	\$ 213	n/a	n/a	\$ 213	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.04	\$ 122	\$ 5	n/a	n/a	\$ 5	100%
4. \$50,001 - \$100,000	Base Cost (For the first \$50,000)		2.83	\$ 122	\$ 345	n/a	n/a	\$ 345	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.12	\$ 122	\$ 15	n/a	n/a	\$ 15	100%
5. \$100,001 - \$500,000	Base Cost (For the first \$100,000)		9.00	\$ 122	\$ 1,095	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,095	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.05	\$ 122	\$ 7	n/a	n/a	\$ 7	100%
6. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	Base Cost (For the first \$500,000)		30.50	\$ 122	\$ 3,710	n/a	n/a	\$ 3,710	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.06	\$ 122	\$ 7	n/a	n/a	\$ 7	100%
7. \$1,000,001 and up	Base Cost (For the first \$1,000,000)		60.00	\$ 122	\$ 7,298	n/a	n/a	\$ 7,298	100%
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		0.04	\$ 122	\$ 5	n/a	n/a	\$ 5	100%
			864.50	\$ 122	\$ 105,156			\$ 105,156	100%

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Activity	Unit	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
			Estimated Average Labor Time Per Unit (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>E. Miscellaneous Building Fees</b>									
<b>1 Administrative Fee</b>		[9]							
A variable fee = A + Bv where v = valuation associated with permit									
A = fix fee component =									
Fixed Fee			0.42	\$ 85	\$ 35	\$30.00	n/a	\$ 35	100%
B = variable fee component =									
Per valuation			0.00000733	\$ 85	\$ 0.001	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.001	100%
not to exceed maximum fee =\$500									
<b>2 Solar PV Permit Fee</b>									
A variable fee = A + Bx where x = kvh rating of PV system									
Plan Review									
			0.50	\$ 139	\$ 69				
Inspection									
			1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122				
A = fix fee component =									
Fixed Fee		[8]	subtotal		\$ 191	n/a	n/a	\$ 191	100%
Plan Review									
			0.00833	\$ 139	\$ 1				
Inspection									
			0.05	\$ 122	\$ 6				
B = variable fee component =									
Per kvh rating of PV system		[8]	subtotal		\$ 7	n/a	n/a	\$ 7	100%
<b>3 Reroof Permit Fee</b>		[7]							
Fee = A + Bx where x = area of roofing in square feet									
A = fix fee component =									
Fixed Fee		[8]	0.50	\$ 122	\$ 61	n/a	n/a	\$ 61	100%
B = variable fee component =									
Per Sq. Ft.		[8]	0.00050	\$ 122	\$ 0.06	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.06	100%
<b>4 Portable Spas and Portable Pools Placed at Grade (Single Family and Duplex Residential Only)</b>									
Plan Review									
			0.25	\$ 139	\$ 35				
Inspection									
			0.50	\$ 122	\$ 61				
Fixed Fee			subtotal		\$ 96	\$ 153	160%	\$ 96	100%

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Activity	Unit	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
			Estimated Average Labor Time Per Unit (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>5 Reinspection Fees</b>									
For second and each additional reinspection:									
5.1 During Normal Business Hours - per hour	Hourly		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 92	76%	\$ 122	100%
Outside Normal Business Hours - * 2 hour minimum	Hourly		2.00	\$ 122	\$ 243	\$ 184	76%	\$ 243	100%
6 Additional Inspection Fee	Hourly		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 92	76%	\$ 122	100%
7 Additional Plan Review Fee	Hourly		1.00	\$ 139	\$ 139	\$ 117	84%	\$ 139	100%
8 Expedited Plan Review (Using Outside Consultants) Actual Cost (including Admin Cost)	Cost + Admin Fee							Cost + Admin Fee	100%
9 Multi-Family Rental Inspection Fee									
9.1 Program Fee		[5]							
For Complexes not the Self-Certification Program:									
A variable fee = A + Bx + Cy where x = number units inspected, and y = total number of units in complex, and A = fix fee component	Fixed Fee		0.83	\$ 122	\$ 101	\$ -	0%	\$ 101	100%
B = variable fee component	Per Unit		0.38	\$ 122	\$ 47	\$ 49	105%	\$ 47	100%
Processing Inspection			0.02	\$ 85	\$ 2				
			0.10	\$ 122	\$ 12				
C = variable fee component	# Units Per Complex		subtotal		\$ 13	\$ -	0%	\$ 13	100%
For Complexes in the Self-Certification Program:									
A variable fee = A + Bx + Cy where x = number units inspected, and y = total number of units in complex, and A = fix fee component	Fixed Fee		0.83	\$ 122	\$ 101	\$ -	0%	\$ 101	100%
B = variable fee component	Per Unit		0.38	\$ 122	\$ 47	\$ 49	105%	\$ 47	100%
Processing Inspection			0.02	\$ 85	\$ 2				
			0.10	\$ 122	\$ 12				
C = variable fee component	# Units Per Complex		subtotal		\$ 13	\$ -	0%	\$ 13	100%

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Activity	Unit	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
			Estimated Average Labor Time Per Unit (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
9.2 Unit Re-Inspection Fee (per visit) A variable fee = D + Ex where x = number of units inspected D = fix fee component E = variable fee component	Fixed Fee		0.50	\$ 122	\$ 61	\$ -	0%	\$ 61	100%
	Per Unit		0.21	\$ 122	\$ 26	\$ -	0%	\$ 26	100%
9.3 Enforcement Inspection - Units (per visit) A variable fee = A + Bx where x = number of units inspected A = fix fee component B = variable fee component	Fixed Fee	[6]	0.83	\$ 122	\$ 101	\$ -	0%	\$ 101	100%
	Per Unit		0.38	\$ 122	\$ 47	\$ -	0%	\$ 47	100%
9.4 Enforcement Inspection - Site	Hourly	[6]	1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 109	90%	\$ 122	100%
9.5 Self Certification Application Fee (Per Complex) Processing Inspection	Per Complex	[10]	0.33	\$ 85	\$ 28	\$ 65	38%	\$ 170	100%
			1.17	\$ 122	\$ 142				
			subtotal		\$ 170				
9.6 Site Re-Inspection	Hourly		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 109	90%	\$ 122	100%

CITY OF CONCORD  
 COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
 User Fee Study  
 Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Activity	Unit	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
			Estimated Average Labor Time Per Unit (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
10 Imaging Fee	<=11x17	Per Sheet			\$ 1.70	\$1.50	88%	\$ 1.70	100%
	>11x17	Per Sheet			\$ 3.90	\$3.50	90%	\$ 3.90	100%
11 Technology Fee	Building	[7]						7%	
	Planning	[7]						7%	
	Engineering	[7]						7%	
<b>TOTAL BUILDING</b>									

- [1] **Valuation-Based Inspection Fees:** Includes required inspections for all construction codes adopted by the City. For projects where the scope of work only includes Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Mechanical work, use the Valuation-Based PEM Inspection Fees table instead
- [2] **Valuation-Based Plan Review Fees:** Includes required plan review for all construction codes adopted by the City. For projects where the scope of work only includes Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Mechanical work, use the Valuation-Based PEM Plan Review Fees table instead. The fee includes one round of comments plus one back check. Additional plan review required following the back check will be charged based upon the plan review hourly rate)
- [3] **Valuation-Based Plumbing, Electrical and/or Mechanical Plan Review Fees:** Includes required plan review for projects where the scope of work only includes Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Mechanical work. For work that includes other construction codes, use the Valuation-Based Plan Review Fees table instead. The fee includes one round of comments plus one back check. Additional plan review required following the back check will be charged based upon the plan review hourly rate.
- [4] **Valuation-Based Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Inspection Fees:** Includes required inspections for projects where the scope of work only includes Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Mechanical work. For work that includes other construction codes, use the Valuation-Based Inspection Fees table instead.
- [5] **Multi-Family Rental Inspection Fee -** The Program Fee applies to both non-self-certification properties and to self-certification properties. The 'C' component will apply to all non-self-certification properties in each year of the program cycle. The "C" component for self-certification properties will only apply to the first year of their assigned program cycle.
- [6] **Multi-Family Rental Inspection Fee -** Fee only applies when alleged violations are confirmed by inspector.
- Technology Fee -** Percent of Fee collected on administrative processing, plan review and inspection fees
- [8] Current Fee structure does not match proposed structure, therefore no current fee is included for comparison
- [9] Proposed Fee Structure replaces the current Table 3A, 3B and 3C
- [10] Reduced volume count to 5 estimated at year

CITY OF CONCORD  
 COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
 User Fee Study  
 Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis

Activity	Unit	Notes	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
<b>A. Building Permit</b>		[9]		\$ 1,075,000		
<b>Valuation-Based Inspection Fees</b>		[1]				
1. \$1 - \$2,000	Fixed Fee		47	n/a	\$ 4,288	\$ 4,288
2. \$2,001 - \$25,000	Base Cost (For the first \$2,000) Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		619	n/a	\$ 56,470	\$ 56,470
			5,582	n/a	\$ 66,426	\$ 66,426
3. \$25,001 - \$50,000	Base Cost (For the first \$25,000) Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		73	n/a	\$ 26,639	\$ 26,639
			873	n/a	\$ 12,746	\$ 12,746
4. \$50,001 - \$100,000	Base Cost (For the first \$50,000) Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		43	n/a	\$ 31,383	\$ 31,383
			1,112	n/a	\$ 21,873	\$ 21,873
5. \$100,001 - \$500,000	Base Cost (For the first \$100,000) Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		63	n/a	\$ 107,923	\$ 107,923
			8,434	n/a	\$ 136,968	\$ 136,968
6. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	Base Cost (For the first \$500,000) Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		8	n/a	\$ 65,684	\$ 65,684
			1,431	n/a	\$ 24,542	\$ 24,542
7. \$1,000,001 and up	Base Cost (For the first \$1,000,000) Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		4	n/a	\$ 67,144	\$ 67,144
			60,720	n/a	\$ 388,608	\$ 388,608

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis

Activity	Unit	Notes	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
<b>Valuation-Based Plan Review Fees</b>		[2]		\$ 677,000		
1. \$1 - \$2,000	Flat Fee		12	n/a	\$ 778	\$ 778
2. \$2,001 - \$25,000	Base Cost (For the first \$2,000)		265	n/a	\$ 17,183	\$ 17,183
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		2,821	n/a	\$ 21,863	\$ 21,863
3. \$25,001 - \$50,000	Base Cost (For the first \$25,000)		53	n/a	\$ 12,887	\$ 12,887
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		697	n/a	\$ 12,915	\$ 12,915
4. \$50,001 - \$100,000	Base Cost (For the first \$50,000)		37	n/a	\$ 26,134	\$ 26,134
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		974	n/a	\$ 14,211	\$ 14,211
5. \$100,001 - \$500,000	Base Cost (For the first \$100,000)		64	n/a	\$ 91,890	\$ 91,890
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		8,100	n/a	\$ 86,265	\$ 86,265
6. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	Base Cost (For the first \$500,000)		6	n/a	\$ 34,181	\$ 34,181
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		1,321	n/a	\$ 11,255	\$ 11,255
7. \$1,000,001 and up	Base Cost (For the first \$1,000,000)		1	n/a	\$ 9,958	\$ 9,958
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		2,500	n/a	\$ 2,700	\$ 2,700

CITY OF CONCORD  
 COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
 User Fee Study  
 Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis

Activity	Unit	Notes	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
Miscellaneous Plumbing, Electrical and Mechanical Plan Review		[3,9]		\$69,000.00		
1. \$1 - \$2,000 -Over the Counter	Fixed Fee		12	n/a	\$ 528	\$ 528
2. \$2,001 - \$25,000	Base Cost (For the first \$2,000)		265	n/a	\$ 11,660	\$ 11,660
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		2,821	n/a	\$ 8,802	\$ 8,802
3. \$25,001 - \$50,000	Base Cost (For the first \$25,000)		53	n/a	\$ 6,137	\$ 6,137
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		697	n/a	\$ 6,782	\$ 6,782
4. \$50,001 - \$100,000	Base Cost (For the first \$50,000)		37	n/a	\$ 13,281	\$ 13,281
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		974	n/a	\$ 7,899	\$ 7,899
5. \$100,001 - \$500,000	Base Cost (For the first \$100,000)		64	n/a	\$ 48,909	\$ 48,909
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		8,100	n/a	\$ 29,079	\$ 29,079
6. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	Base Cost (For the first \$500,000)		6	n/a	\$ 13,200	\$ 13,200
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		1,321	n/a	\$ 5,694	\$ 5,694
7. \$1,000,001 and up	Base Cost (For the first \$1,000,000)		1	n/a	\$ 4,354	\$ 4,354
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		-	n/a	\$ -	\$ -

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis

Activity	Unit	Notes	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
<b>Miscellaneous Plumbing, Electrical and Mechanical Permit / Inspection</b>		[4,9]		\$409,000.00		
1. \$1 - \$2,000	Fixed Fee		12	n/a	\$ 1,216	\$ 1,216
2. \$5,001 - \$25,000	Base Cost (For the first \$2,000)		265	n/a	\$ 26,862	\$ 26,862
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		2,821	n/a	\$ 13,682	\$ 13,682
3. \$25,001 - \$50,000	Base Cost (For the first \$25,000)		53	n/a	\$ 11,282	\$ 11,282
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		697	n/a	\$ 3,673	\$ 3,673
4. \$50,001 - \$100,000	Base Cost (For the first \$50,000)		37	n/a	\$ 12,752	\$ 12,752
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		974	n/a	\$ 14,610	\$ 14,610
5. \$100,001 - \$500,000	Base Cost (For the first \$100,000)		64	n/a	\$ 70,063	\$ 70,063
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		8,100	n/a	\$ 52,974	\$ 52,974
6. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	Base Cost (For the first \$500,000)		6	n/a	\$ 22,260	\$ 22,260
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		1,321	n/a	\$ 9,485	\$ 9,485
7. \$1,000,001 and up	Base Cost (For the first \$1,000,000)		1	n/a	\$ 7,298	\$ 7,298
	Each Add'l \$1000 or fraction thereof		-	n/a	\$ -	\$ -

CITY OF CONCORD  
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
User Fee Study  
Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis

Activity	Unit	Notes	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
<b>E. Miscellaneous Building Fees</b>						
<b>1 Administrative Fee</b>		[9]				
A variable fee = A + Bv where v = valuation associated with permit						
A = fix fee component =						
Fixed Fee			4,812	\$ 144,360	\$ 170,768	\$ 170,768
B = variable fee component =						
Per valuation			-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
not to exceed maximum fee =\$500						
<b>2 Solar PV Permit Fee</b>						
A variable fee = A + Bx where x = kvh rating of PV system						
Plan Review						
Inspection						
A = fix fee component =						
Fixed Fee		[8]	814	\$ 95,075	\$ 155,564	\$ 155,564
Plan Review						
Inspection						
B = variable fee component =						
Per kvh rating of PV system		[8]	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>3 Reroof Permit Fee</b>		[7]				
Fee = A + Bx where x = area of roofing in square feet						
A = fix fee component =						
Fixed Fee		[8]	457	\$ 80,565	\$ 27,794	\$ 27,794
B = variable fee component =						
Per Sq. Ft.		[8]	457	\$ -	\$ 28	\$ 28
<b>4 Portable Spas and Portable Pools Placed at Grade (Single Family and Duplex Residential Only)</b>						
Plan Review						
Inspection						
Fixed Fee			-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

CITY OF CONCORD  
 COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
 User Fee Study  
 Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis

Activity	Unit	Notes	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
<b>5 Reinspection Fees</b>						
For second and each additional reinspection:						
5.1 During Normal Business Hours - per hour	Hourly		3	\$ 273	\$ 361	\$ 361
5.2 Outside Normal Business Hours - * 2 hour minimum	Hourly		-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6 Additional Inspection Fee	Hourly		3	\$ 273	\$ 361	\$ 361
7 Additional Plan Review Fee	Hourly		284	\$ 33,274	\$ 39,516	\$ 39,516
8 Expedited Plan Review (Using Outside Consultants) Actual Cost (including Admin Cost)	Cost + Admin Fee					
9 Multi-Family Rental Inspection Fee						
9.1 Program Fee		[5]				
For Complexes not the Self-Certification Program:						
A variable fee = A + Bx + Cy where x = number units inspected, and y = total number of units in complex, and A = fix fee component	Fixed Fee		211	\$ -	\$ 21,379	\$ 21,379
B = variable fee component	Per Unit		819	\$ 53,475	\$ 38,132	\$ 38,132
Processing Inspection						
C = variable fee component	# Units Per Complex		3,274	\$ -	\$ 43,924	\$ 43,924
For Complexes in the Self-Certification Program:						
A variable fee = A + Bx + Cy where x = number units inspected, and y = total number of units in complex, and A = fix fee component	Fixed Fee		184	\$ -	\$ 18,644	\$ 18,644
B = variable fee component	Per Unit		1,573	\$ 61,662	\$ 73,282	\$ 73,282
Processing Inspection						
C = variable fee component	# Units Per Complex		6,292	\$ -	\$ 84,413	\$ 84,413

CITY OF CONCORD  
 COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
 User Fee Study  
 Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis

Activity	Unit	Notes	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
9.2 Unit Re-Inspection Fee (per visit) A variable fee = D + Ex where x = number of units inspected D = fix fee component E = variable fee component	Fixed Fee		-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Per Unit		-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9.3 Enforcement Inspection - Units (per visit) A variable fee = A + Bx where x = number of units inspected A = fix fee component B = variable fee component	Fixed Fee	[6]	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Per Unit		-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9.4 Enforcement Inspection - Site	Hourly	[6]	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9.5 Self Certification Application Fee (Per Complex) Processing Inspection	Per Complex	[10]	61	\$ 3,987	\$ 852	\$ 852
9.6 Site Re-Inspection	Hourly		-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

CITY OF CONCORD  
 COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - BUILDING  
 User Fee Study  
 Direct Labor Cost Detail - Fiscal Year 14/15 Budget

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells identified in blue font; formula based cells identified in black font

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Inspection	\$	122
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Plan Review	\$	139
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate Processing	\$	85

Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis

Activity	Unit	Notes	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
<b>10 Imaging Fee</b>						
<=11x17	Per Sheet		33,000	\$ 49,500	\$ 56,181	\$ 56,181
>11x17	Per Sheet		2,688	\$ 9,408	\$ 10,490	\$ 10,490
<b>11 Technology Fee</b>						
Building	Percent of Fee	[7]		\$ -	\$ 158,585	
Planning	Percent of Fee	[7]		\$ -	\$ 21,415	
Engineering	Percent of Fee	[7]		\$ -	\$ 80,401	
<b>TOTAL BUILDING</b>				<b>\$ 2,761,852</b>	<b>\$ 2,764,001</b>	<b>\$ 2,503,600</b>

- [1] **Valuation-Based Inspection Fees:** Includes required inspections for all construction codes adopted by the City. For projects where the scope of work only includes Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Mechanical work, use the Valuation-Based PEM Inspection Fees table instead
- [2] **Valuation-Based Plan Review Fees:** Includes required plan review for all construction codes adopted by the City. For projects where the scope of work only includes Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Mechanical work, use the Valuation-Based PEM Plan Review Fees table instead. The fee includes one round of comments plus one back check. Additional plan review required following the back check will be charged based upon the plan review hourly rate)
- [3] **Valuation-Based Plumbing, Electrical and/or Mechanical Plan Review Fees:** Includes required plan review for projects where the scope of work only includes Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Mechanical work. For work that includes other construction codes, use the Valuation-Based Plan Review Fees table instead. The fee includes one round of comments plus one back check. Additional plan review required following the back check will be charged based upon the plan review hourly rate.
- [4] **Valuation-Based Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Inspection Fees:** Includes required inspections for projects where the scope of work only includes Plumbing, Electrical, and/or Mechanical work. For work that includes other construction codes, use the Valuation-Based Inspection Fees table instead.
- [5] **Multi-Family Rental Inspection Fee -** The Program Fee applies to both non-self-certification properties and to self-certification properties. The 'C' component will apply to all non-self-certification properties in each year of the program cycle. The "C" component for self-certification properties will only apply to the first year of their assigned program cycle.
- [6] **Multi-Family Rental Inspection Fee -** Fee only applies when alleged violations are confirmed by inspector.
- Technology Fee -** Percent of Fee collected on administrative processing, plan review and inspection fees
- [7]
- [8] Current Fee structure does not match proposed structure, therefore no current fee is included for comparison
- [9] Proposed Fee Structure replaces the current Table 3A, 3B and 3C
- [10] Reduced volume count to 5 estimated at year

Fee Activity		Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
Group	Permit Description	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>POLICE FEES</b>								
<b>1</b>	<b>Alarm Systems</b>							
1.1	Alarm system use permit fee (CMC 18-93(e))	0.17	\$ 122	\$ 21	\$ 40	192%	\$ 21	100%
1.2	False alarm service charges (CMC 18-95)				\$ 135			
1.2.1	False alarm 4, 5, and 6 in any 60-day period				\$ 135			
1.2.2	False alarm 9, 10, 11 in any 360-day period				\$ 270			
1.2.3	False alarm 7 and 8 in any 60-day period				\$ 270			
1.2.4	False alarm 12 and 13 in any 360-day period				\$ 401			
1.2.5	Each additional false alarm after the 8th in any 60-day period				\$ 401			
1.2.6	Each additional false alarm after the 13th in any 360-day period							
	False Alarm Response							
	Sworn	0.57	\$ 202	\$ 115				
	Non-Sworn	0.08	\$ 122	\$ 10				
				\$ 124				
<b>2</b>	<b>Clearance Letters</b>							
2.1	Fee for resident	0.08	\$ 122	\$ 10	\$ 30	307%	\$ 10	100%
2.2	Fee for non-resident	0.08	\$ 122	\$ 10	\$ 45	460%	\$ 10	100%
<b>3</b>	<b>Concealed Weapons Dealer Permit (P&amp;P 81) (confirm weapons dealer)</b>							
3.1	Initial fee	1.00	\$ 202	\$ 202	\$ 520	257%	\$ 202	100%
3.2	Annual renewal of existing license	0.50	\$ 202	\$ 101	\$ 115	114%	\$ 101	100%
<b>4</b>	<b>Emergency Response Cost Recovery</b>							
4.1	Recovery of expenses for police emergency response as permitted by Government Code, Title 5, Article 8, Sections 53150-53158, Not to exceed \$12K per incident - Per Hour (2 hour minimum)	1.00	\$ 202	\$ 202	\$ 140	69%	\$ 202	100%
4.2	Emergency Response Administrative Fee	1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 100	82%	\$ 122	100%
<b>5</b>	<b>Fingerprint Services (Non-criminal)</b>							
	Rolling fee / livescan	0.33	\$ 122	\$ 41	\$ 41	101%	\$ 41	100%
<b>6</b>	<b>Concealed weapons permits</b>							
6.1	City processing fee	1.00	\$ 202	\$ 202	\$ 155	77%	\$ 202	100%
6.2	Annual renewal City processing fee	1.00	\$ 202	\$ 202	\$ 41	20%	\$ 202	100%
<b>7</b>	<b>Gun Storage Services Pursuant to Court Orders</b>							
7.1	Administration Processing Fee per incident	1.50	\$ 122	\$ 183	\$ 60	33%	\$ 183	100%
7.2	Storage Fee per month (or any fraction thereof) per gun	0.05	\$ 122	\$ 6	\$ 5	82%	\$ 6	100%
<b>8</b>	<b>Parking Enforcement</b>							
8.1	California Vehicle Code							
8.2	Concord Municipal Code							
8.3	Late Fees							
8.3.1	Sections 22507.8a, 22507.8b, 22507.8c, 22511.57a, 22511.57b, 22511.57c, 22522				\$ 0.20			
8.3.2	All other sections (percent of fine)				\$ 1			
8.3.3	Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) hold (per hold)				\$ 20			
8.3.4	State Franchise Board (FTB) Fee - Social Security Request				\$ 20			
8.3.5	State Franchise Board (FTB) Fee - percent of outstanding balance submittals				\$ 0			

Fee Activity		Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
Group	Permit Description	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
9	<b>Police reports</b>							
	Per copy - public records	(5)			\$ 0.10		\$ 0.10	
10	<b>Processing of Photographs</b>							
10.1	Electronic Data Request (existing file)	(6)	\$ 122	\$ 6	\$ 25	409%	\$ 6	100%
10.2	Electronic Data Request (non-existing file; copy of producing disk & mailing)	(6)	\$ 122	\$ 31	\$ 25	82%	\$ 31	100%
11	<b>Review of Local Criminal History</b>							
	Summary information by individuals who may have records with Police Department (non-refundable)		\$ 122	\$ 21	\$ 45	216%	\$ 21	100%
12	<b>Rotation Towing Services (CMC 54-155)</b>							
12.1	Application and Administration Fees							
12.1.1	Initial application fee for Rotational Tow Truck Business		\$ 122	\$ 183	\$ 425	232%	\$ 183	100%
12.1.2	Driver Application Fee - New	(3)	\$ 122	\$ 61	\$ 121	198%	\$ 61	100%
12.1.3	Driver Application Fee - Renewal		\$ 122	\$ 31	\$ 77	252%	\$ 31	100%
12.1.4	Driver Transfer Fee		\$ 122	\$ 21	\$ 80	385%	\$ 21	100%
12.1.5	Replacement I.D. card		\$ 122	\$ 10	\$ 45	460%	\$ 10	100%
12.1.6	Franchise Fee Per Tow	(1)			\$ 30			
12.2	Maximum Rates Chargeable by Rotation List Towing Operators							
	Straight tow of one hour or less	(1)			\$ 175			
	Tow with dolly or car carrier when necessary. Operator must indicate on tow bill why a dolly or car carrier was used	(1)			\$ 195			
	Tow services exceeding one hour or Per 15-minute intervals	(1)			\$ 175			
	Non-tow service call - per half hour	(1)			\$ 44			
	Per towed mile outside the City limits	(1)			\$ 40			
	No mileage may be charged for towing to an operator's lot located outside the City limits	(1)			\$ 6			
	Daily storage fee from midnight to midnight	(1)			\$ 55			
	Gate release charge for vehicle pickup before 8 a.m. or after 5 p.m.	(1)			\$ 60			
	Release fee per vehicle	(1)			\$ 50			
	Drop Fee per vehicle	(1)			\$ 88			
	Class B (26,001 GVW) tow of one hour or less	(1)			\$ 225			
	Daily storage fee from midnight to midnight - Class B	(1)			\$ 55			
	Class C (48,000 GVW) tow of one hour or less	(1)			\$ 275			
	Daily storage fee from midnight to midnight - Class C	(1)			\$ 125			
	Class D (52,000 GVW) tow of one hour or less	(1)			\$ 325			
	Daily storage fee from midnight to midnight - Class D	(1)			\$ 140			
	Low Boy Trailer	(1)			\$ 135			
12.3	Rates for City of Concord Tows							
	Class A (14,000 minimum GVW) per hour	(1)			Free			
	Class B (26,001 minimum GVW) per hour	(1)			\$ 125			
	Class C (48,000 minimum GVW) per hour	(1)			\$ 135			
	Class D (52,000 minimum GVW) per hour	(1)			\$ 145			
	Low Boy Trailer	(1)			\$ 135			
12.4	Tow Management Software fee (Administrative Fee)	(1)			\$ 10			

Fee Activity		Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
Group	Permit Description	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
13	<b>Second Hand Dealer</b> Administrative processing fee (Covers the Two Year Permit Period)	5.00	\$ 122	\$ 612	\$ 752	123%	\$ 612	100%
14	<b>Vehicle Abatement</b> Administration Fee - Vehicle Abatement Procedure	0.25	\$ 122	\$ 31	\$ 105	343%	\$ 31	100%
15	<b>Vehicle Identification Numbers</b> Administration Fee - Vehicle Abatement Procedure	0.25	\$ 202	\$ 51	\$ 50	99%	\$ 51	100%
16	<b>Vehicle Inspection and Citation Sign Off</b>							
16.1	Concord Resident	0.17	\$ 122	\$ 21	\$ 15	72%	\$ 21	100%
16.2	Non-Concord Resident	0.17	\$ 122	\$ 21	\$ 20	96%	\$ 21	100%
<b>BUSINESS, PROFESSIONS AND TRADES FEES</b>								
17	<b>Administrative Processing Fee for Business Licenses or Permits</b>							
17.1	Administrative processing fee issue of new license or permits	[7] 0.75	\$ 87	\$ 66	\$ 18	27%	\$ 66	100%
17.2	Administrative processing fee renewal of license or permits	[7] 0.50	\$ 87	\$ 44	\$ 18	41%	\$ 44	100%
17.3	Business License Exemption Audit Fee	[7] 2.50	\$ 87	\$ 219	\$ 284	130%	\$ 219	100%
18	<b>Cardroom Permits</b>							
18.1	Application fees (CMC 6-121.(d)(12))				No Fee		No Fee	
18.2	Annual cardroom license fee (CMC 6-121.(j))	3.00	\$ 202	\$ 607	\$ 525	87%	\$ 607	
18.3	Annual per table fee (CMC 6-121.(j))	3.00	\$ 202	\$ 607	\$ 525	87%	\$ 607	
18.4	Assignment or transfer of license fee (CMC 6-121.(n))				No Fee		No Fee	
18.5	Cardroom Employee Work Permit:							
18.5.1	Work permit fee (CMC 6-123.(d))	0.25	\$ 202	\$ 51	\$ 45	89%	\$ 51	
18.5.2	Renewal application fee (CMC 6-123.(c))	0.33	\$ 122	\$ 41	\$ 45	110%	\$ 41	
18.5.3	Duplicate ID cards for cardroom employees	0.17	\$ 122	\$ 21	\$ 19	91%	\$ 21	
18.6	Fingerprinting processing fee				\$ 41		\$ 41	
18.7	Administrative processing fee				See 17		See 17	
19	<b>Door-to-Door Solicitation Permits</b>							
	Application and Investigation Fee	0.17	\$ 202	\$ 34	\$ 27	80%	\$ 34	
20	<b>Entertainment Permits (CMC 6-193(8))</b>							
20.1	Application fee	1.00	\$ 202	\$ 202	\$ 150	74%	\$ 202	
20.2	Permit fee							
20.2.1	Resident	0.17	\$ 122	\$ 20	\$ 20	98%	\$ 20	
20.2.2	Nonresident	0.17	\$ 122	\$ 20	\$ 30	147%	\$ 20	
20.3	Fingerprinting processing fee				\$ 41		\$ 41	
20.4	Administrative processing fee				See 17		See 17	
20.5	Late application renewal fee (entertainment permit approved after expiration of existing permit)				\$ 75		\$ 75	
21	<b>Escort Service Permits (CMC 18-121 - 18-130)</b>							
21.1	License (owner)	3.00	\$ 202	\$ 607	\$ 530	87%	\$ 607	
21.2	Permit (employee)	0.50	\$ 202	\$ 101	\$ 92	91%	\$ 101	
21.3	Fingerprinting processing fee (as set by State and Federal agencies 11/92)				Actual Cost		Actual Cost	
21.4	Administrative processing fee				See 17		See 17	
22	<b>Massage Parlors, Out-Call Massage Services, and Massage Therapy Technician Permits</b>							
22.1	Massage parlor permit fee (CMC 18-277.(b))	0.75	\$ 202	\$ 152	\$ 138	91%	\$ 152	
22.2	Massage Therapy Technician permit fee (CMC 18-278(b))	0.50	\$ 202	\$ 101	\$ 72	71%	\$ 101	

Fee Activity		Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
Group	Permit Description	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
22.3	Administrative processing fee				See 17		See 17	
22.4	Fingerprinting processing fee				\$ 41		\$ 41	
23	<b>Public Motor Vehicle Permits</b>							
	Vehicle Permit (CMC 118-58(a))							
23.1	Annual permit fee - 1st vehicle	1.00	\$ 202	\$ 202	\$ 179	88%	\$ 202	
23.2	Application processing fee for Taxi Business (includes State fee)	2.50	\$ 202	\$ 506	\$ 440	87%	\$ 506	
23.3	Each additional vehicle	0.50	\$ 202	\$ 101	\$ 92	91%	\$ 101	
23.4	Late payment penalty (per month)				20%		20%	
	Maximum (cumulative)				50%		50%	
23.5	Reinspection fee (CMC 118-90(l))	0.17	\$ 202	\$ 34	\$ 25	74%	\$ 34	
23.6	Administrative processing fee				See 17		See 17	
	Driver Permits (CMC 118-72(a))							
23.7	Application fee - New (02-07-12)	0.75	\$ 202	\$ 152	\$ 121	80%	\$ 152	
	Plus State and FBI Livescan fee				Actual Cost		Actual Cost	
23.8	Application fee - non-resident	0.75	\$ 202	\$ 152	\$ 77	51%	\$ 152	
	Plus State fee				Actual Cost		Actual Cost	
23.9	Fingerprinting processing fee				\$ 41		\$ 41	
23.10	Administrative processing fee				See 17		See 17	
23.11	Driver Transfer Fee	0.67	\$ 122	\$ 82	\$ 80	98%	\$ 82	
23.12	Replacement Driver ID Card	0.17	\$ 122	\$ 21	\$ 45	216%	\$ 21	
23.13	Taxicab Rates (CMC 118-88,(d))							
	Drop fee				\$ 3.05		\$ 3.05	
	Each 1/10 mile thereafter				\$ 0.30		\$ 0.30	
	or Each mile thereafter				\$ 3.00		\$ 3.00	
	Delivery - meter rate plus				\$ 4.25		\$ 4.25	
	Waiting time, traffic delay per every 36 seconds				\$ 0.30		\$ 0.30	
	Waiting Time, traffic delay per hour				\$ 30.00		\$ 30.00	
24	<b>Tobacco Retailers License (CMC 38-70)</b>							
24.1	Administrative and Enforcment Fee	1.00	\$ 202	\$ 202	\$ 175	87%	\$ 202	
24.2	Hearing Fee	2.00	\$ 202	\$ 405	\$ 375	93%	\$ 405	
24.3	Re-Inspection Fee	0.67	\$ 202	\$ 135	\$ 120	89%	\$ 135	

Fee Activity		Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis			
Group	Permit Description	Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>25</b>	<b>Video Games Permits</b>							
25.1	Use permit application fee to Police Department to cover cost of investigation (CMC 6-234) (Does not include State fingerprint processing fee)	3.68	\$ 202	\$ 745	\$ 677	91%	\$ 745	
25.2	Manager's license fee to Police Department to cover cost of investigation. (Charged only if manager is not a Use Permit applicant.) (CMC 6-236) (Does not include required State fingerprint processing fee)	2.50	\$ 202	\$ 506	\$ 440	87%	\$ 506	
25.3	Administrative processing fee				See 17		See 17	
<b>OTHER FEES</b>								
26	Referee Sample Request * * Plus actual costs for shipping if applicable	1.08	\$ 122	\$ 132	\$ 41	31%	\$ 132 Actual Costs	100%
<b>HOURLY RATES</b>								
	Sworn	1.00	\$ 202	\$ 202				
	Non-Sworn	1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122				
	For services requested of City staff which have no fee listed in this fee schedule, the City Manager of the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the established hourly rates for this division. Additionally, the City will pass-through to the applicant any discrete costs incurred from the use of external service providers if required to process the specific application.							

**TOTAL POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**Notes**

- [1] Placeholder for Master Fee Schedule (MFS); Not included in cost analysis
- [2] Cost provided for informational purposes only
- [3] Plus State fingerprint processing fee.
- [4] Fingerprint fees do not include any federal, state, or other agency fingerprint charge; which may be added at time of service based on current rates
- [5] Per copy fee; consistent with City Clerk's office
- [6] New Fee
- [7] Service provided by Finance

Fee Activity		Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
Group	Permit Description	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
	<b>POLICE FEES</b>				
<b>1</b>	<b>Alarm Systems</b>				
1.1	Alarm system use permit fee (CMC 18-93(e))	900	\$ 36,000	\$ 18,712	\$ 18,712
1.2	False alarm service charges (CMC 18-95)				
1.2.1	False alarm 4, 5, and 6 in any 60-day period	70	\$ 9,450	\$ 9,450	\$ 9,450
1.2.2	False alarm 9, 10, 11 in any 360-day period	50	\$ 6,750	\$ 6,750	\$ 6,750
1.2.3	False alarm 7 and 8 in any 60-day period	8	\$ 2,160	\$ 2,160	\$ 2,160
1.2.4	False alarm 12 and 13 in any 360-day period	27	\$ 7,290	\$ 7,290	\$ 7,290
1.2.5	Each additional false alarm after the 8th in any 60-day period	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
1.2.6	Each additional false alarm after the 13th in any 360-day period	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	False Alarm Response				
	Sworn				
	Non-Sworn				
<b>2</b>	<b>Clearance Letters</b>				
2.1	Fee for resident	180	\$ 5,400	\$ 1,761	\$ 1,761
2.2	Fee for non-resident	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>3</b>	<b>Concealed Weapons Dealer Permit (P&amp;P 81) (confirm weapons dealer)</b>				
3.1	Initial fee	3	\$ 1,560	\$ 607	\$ 607
3.2	Annual renewal of existing license	1	\$ 115	\$ 101	\$ 101
<b>4</b>	<b>Emergency Response Cost Recovery</b>				
4.1	Recovery of expenses for police emergency response as permitted by Government Code, Title 5, Article 8, Sections 53150-53158, Not to exceed \$12K per incident - Per Hour (2 hour minimum)	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4.2	Emergency Response Administrative Fee	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>5</b>	<b>Fingerprint Services (Non-criminal)</b>				
	Rolling fee / livescan	727	\$ 29,807	\$ 29,638	\$ 29,638
<b>6</b>	<b>Concealed weapons permits</b>				
6.1	City processing fee	3	\$ 465	\$ 607	\$ 607
6.2	Annual renewal City processing fee	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>7</b>	<b>Gun Storage Services Pursuant to Court Orders</b>				
7.1	Administration Processing Fee per incident	11	\$ 660	\$ 2,018	\$ 2,018
7.2	Storage Fee per month (or any fraction thereof) per gun	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>8</b>	<b>Parking Enforcement</b>				
8.1	California Vehicle Code				
8.2	Concord Municipal Code				
8.3	Late Fees				
8.3.1	Sections 22507.8a, 22507.8b, 22507.8c, 22511.57a, 22511.57b, 22511.57c, 22522				
8.3.2	All other sections (percent of fine)				
8.3.3	Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) hold (per hold)				
8.3.4	State Franchise Board (FTB) Fee - Social Security Request				
8.3.5	State Franchise Board (FTB) Fee - percent of outstanding balance submittals				

Fee Activity		Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
Group	Permit Description	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
<b>9</b>	<b>Police reports</b>				
	Per copy - public records	[5]			
<b>10</b>	<b>Processing of Photographs</b>				
<b>10.1</b>	Electronic Data Request (existing file)	[6]	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>10.2</b>	Electronic Data Request (non-existing file; copy of producing disk & mailing)	[6]	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>11</b>	<b>Review of Local Criminal History</b>				
	Summary information by individuals who may have records with Police Department (non-refundable)	5	\$ 225	\$ 104	\$ 104
<b>12</b>	<b>Rotation Towing Services (CMC 54-155)</b>				
<b>12.1</b>	Application and Administration Fees				
<b>12.1.1</b>	Initial application fee for Rotational Tow Truck Business	1	\$ 425	\$ 183	\$ 183
<b>12.1.2</b>	Driver Application Fee - New	[3]	\$ 3,630	\$ 1,835	\$ 1,835
<b>12.1.3</b>	Driver Application Fee - Renewal	15	\$ 1,155	\$ 459	\$ 459
<b>12.1.4</b>	Driver Transfer Fee	5	\$ 400	\$ 104	\$ 104
<b>12.1.5</b>	Replacement I.D. card	5	\$ 225	\$ 49	\$ 49
<b>12.1.6</b>	Franchise Fee Per Tow	[1]			
<b>12.2</b>	Maximum Rates Chargeable by Rotation List Towing Operators	[1]			
	Straight tow of one hour or less	[1]			
	Tow with dolly or car carrier when necessary. Operator must indicate on tow bill why a dolly or car carrier was used	[1]			
	Tow services exceeding one hour or Per 15-minute intervals	[1]			
	Non-tow service call - per half hour	[1]			
	Per towed mile outside the City limits	[1]			
	No mileage may be charged for towing to an operator's lot located outside the City limits	[1]			
	Daily storage fee from midnight to midnight	[1]			
	Gate release charge for vehicle pickup before 8 a.m. or after 5 p.m.	[1]			
	Release fee per vehicle	[1]			
	Drop Fee per vehicle	[1]			
	Class B (26,001 GVW) tow of one hour or less	[1]			
	Daily storage fee from midnight to midnight - Class B	[1]			
	Class C (48,000 GVW) tow of one hour or less	[1]			
	Daily storage fee from midnight to midnight - Class C	[1]			
	Class D (52,000 GVW) tow of one hour or less	[1]			
	Daily storage fee from midnight to midnight - Class D	[1]			
	Low Boy Trailer	[1]			
<b>12.3</b>	Rates for City of Concord Tows	[1]			
	Class A (14,000 minimum GVW) per hour	[1]			
	Class B (26,001 minimum GVW) per hour	[1]			
	Class C (48,000 minimum GVW) per hour	[1]			
	Class D (52,000 minimum GVW) per hour	[1]			
	Low Boy Trailer	[1]			
<b>12.4</b>	Tow Management Software fee (Administrative Fee)	[1]			



Fee Activity		Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
Group	Permit Description	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
22.3	Administrative processing fee				
22.4	Fingerprinting processing fee				
23	<b>Public Motor Vehicle Permits</b>				
	Vehicle Permit (CMC 118-58(a))				
23.1	Annual permit fee - 1st vehicle				
23.2	Application processing fee for Taxi Business (includes State fee)				
23.3	Each additional vehicle				
23.4	Late payment penalty (per month) Maximum (cumulative)				
23.5	Reinspection fee (CMC 118-90(l))				
23.6	Administrative processing fee				
	Driver Permits (CMC 118-72(a))				
23.7	Application fee - New (02-07-12) Plus State and FBI Livescan fee				
23.8	Application fee - non-resident Plus State fee				
23.9	Fingerprinting processing fee				
23.10	Administrative processing fee				
23.11	Driver Transfer Fee				
23.12	Replacement Driver ID Card				
23.13	Taxicab Rates (CMC 118-88,(d))	[1]			
	Drop fee	[1]			
	Each 1/10 mile thereafter	[1]			
	or Each mile thereafter	[1]			
	Delivery - meter rate plus	[1]			
	Waiting time, traffic delay per every 36 seconds	[1]			
	Waiting Time, traffic delay per hour	[1]			
24	<b>Tobacco Retailers License (CMC 38-70)</b>				
24.1	Administrative and Enforcement Fee				
24.2	Hearing Fee				
24.3	Re-Inspection Fee				

Fee Activity		Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
Group	Permit Description	Estimated Volume of Activity (Performed)	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
<b>25</b>	<b>Video Games Permits</b>				
25.1	Use permit application fee to Police Department to cover cost of investigation (CMC 6-234) (Does not include State fingerprint processing fee)				
25.2	Manager's license fee to Police Department to cover cost of investigation. (Charged only if manager is not a Use Permit applicant.) (CMC 6-236) (Does not include required State fingerprint processing fee)				
25.3	Administrative processing fee				
<b>OTHER FEES</b>					
26	Referee Sample Request * * Plus actual costs for shipping if applicable	[6] -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>HOURLY RATES</b>					
	Sworn				
	Non-Sworn				
	For services requested of City staff which have no fee listed in this fee schedule, the City Manager of the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the established hourly rates for this division. Additionally, the City will pass-through to the applicant any discrete costs incurred from the use of external service providers if required to process the specific application.				
<b>TOTAL POLICE DEPARTMENT</b>			\$ 124,252	\$ 99,397	\$ 99,397

- Notes**
- [1] Placeholder for Master Fee Schedule (MFS); Not included in cost analysis
  - [2] Cost provided for informational purposes only
  - [3] Plus State fingerprint processing fee.
  - [4] Fingerprint fees do not include any federal, state, or other agency fingerprint charge; which may be added at time of service based on current rates
  - [5] Per copy fee; consistent with City Clerk's office
  - [6] New Fee
  - [7] Service provided by Finance

City of Concord  
 ADMIN - Administrative Fees  
 Cost Estimation for Providing Fee Related Activities and Services

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

No.	Description		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE FEES</b>									
1	<b>Citywide Appeals (Non-CED):</b>								
1.1	Appeal requiring public notice (CMC 2-52)	[2]	1.00	x \$ 117	= \$ 117	\$ 138.00	118%	\$ 117	100%
1.2	Appeal where no public notice is required (CMC 2-53)	[2]	1.00	x \$ 117	= \$ 117	\$ 48.00	41%	\$ 117	100%
2	<b>Copies of Public Records/Information</b>								
2.1	Per page (per case law)					\$ 0.10		\$ 0.10	
2.2	Miscellaneous (includes micro film)	[2]				Cost of Reproduction		Cost of Reproduction	
3	<b>Electronic Data Request (CD/DVD Copy)</b>								
3.1	Copy of Existing Data File	[2]	0.08	x \$ 117	= \$ 9	\$ -	0%	\$ 9	100%
3.2	Copy of Non-Existing Data File	[2]	0.25	x \$ 117	= \$ 29	\$ 24.00	82%	\$ 29	100%
4	<b>Extract of document and certification (each page)</b>								
			0.17	x \$ 117	= \$ 19	\$ 4	21%	\$ 19	100%
5	<b>Certifying documents, Live Certificates (each document)</b>								
			0.25	x \$ 117	= \$ 29	\$ 26	89%	\$ 29	100%
6	<b>Subpoena Fee</b>								
6.1	Response to subpoena - Hourly	[1]				\$ 24		\$ 24	
6.2	Response to subpoena - Records	[1]				\$ 15		\$ 15	
6.3	Response to subpoena - Civil	[1]				\$ 275		\$ 275	
<b>BUSINESS, PROFESSIONS AND TRADES FEES</b>									
7	<b>Administrative Processing Fee for Business Licenses or Permits</b>								
7.1	Administrative processing fee issue of new license or permits	[4,5]	0.75	x \$ 87	= \$ 66	\$ 18	27%	\$ 66	100%
7.2	Administrative processing fee renewal of license or permits	[4,5]	0.50	x \$ 87	= \$ 44	\$ 18	41%	\$ 44	100%
7.3	Business License Exemption Audit Fee		2.50	x \$ 87	= \$ 219	\$ 284	130%	\$ 219	100%
<b>OTHER FEES</b>									
8	<b>Political sign Removal (per sign)</b>	[3]				\$ 18		\$ 20	
9	<b>Housing Rehabilitation Loan Fees</b>	[3]				\$ 85		\$ 85	
	Plus other loan administrative costs. This includes but is not limited to title, lien, registration, appraisal, inspections and other loan processing costs	[3]				Actual Costs		Actual Costs	
10	<b>Subordination Agreement to facilitate Refinance</b>	[3]				\$ 225		\$ 225	
	Per refinance	[3]							
11	<b>Inspection/Abatement Warrants</b>	[3]				\$ 396		\$ 396	
12	<b>Mobilehome Rent Review Fees</b>	[3]							
	For appeals and petitions regarding rent increases in Concord Mobilehome Parks					Actual Costs		Actual Costs	
13	<b>Notice of Intent to Circulate Municipal Initiative Petition</b>	[3]				\$ 200		\$ 200	

City of Concord  
**ADMIN - Administrative Fees**  
**Cost Estimation for Providing Fee Related Activities and Services**

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Input cells in blue font; formula based cells in black font

No.	Description		Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee	Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage
14	<b>Past Due Receivables</b>	[3]							
	A late charge for past due receivables (per month) (of amount due)					3%			
15	<b>Postage and Handling</b>	[3]				Actual Costs		Actual Costs	
16	<b>Rental of Television Facilities (City Council Chamber)</b>	[3]							
	For activities not related to the City of Concord								
16.1	First hour					\$ 168		\$ 168	
16.2	Each additional hour or fraction thereof					\$ 84		\$ 84	
17	<b>Returned Checks</b>	[3,6]							
17.1	First Returned Check					\$ 25		\$ 25	
17.2	Subsequent Returned Checks					\$ 35		\$ 35	
18	<b>City Employee Services - Hourly Rates</b>	[3]				City Formula - actual cost		Actual Costs	
	For services requested of City staff which have no fee listed in this fee schedule, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the established hourly rates for this department/division. Additionally, the City will pass-through to the applicant any discrete costs incurred from the use of external service providers if required to process the specific application.								
<b>TOTAL ADMIN - Administrative Fees</b>								61%	

- Notes
- [1] Evidence Code section 1563
  - [2] New Fee
  - [3] Placeholder for Master Fee Schedule (MFS); Not included in Cost Analysis
  - [4] Updated 7/1/13 Resolution 78-6042
  - [5] Fee included in the Police Fees
  - [6] Per CA Civil Code; 1st NSF Check is limited to \$25 fee; each subsequent NSF check is limited to \$35 fee

CITY OF CONCORD  
PARKS AND RECREATION  
Cost Estimation for Providing Fee Related Activities and Services

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Fee Activity		Cost of Service Activity	Cost Recovery Analysis				Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis		
Description	Current Fee		Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee	
<b>PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES</b>		\$ 7,354,089	[3] \$ 4,117,223	56%	\$ 4,117,223	56%	\$ 4,117,223	\$ 7,354,089	\$ 4,117,223
<b>CAMP CONCORD</b>		\$ 961,361	[3] \$ 261,820	27%	\$ 261,820	27%	\$ 261,820	\$ 961,361	\$ 261,820
Camp Concord - Direct Program Support (100-4200)									
	Budget Expenses	[2] \$ 550,826							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 266,594							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 143,941							
<b>RECREATION SERVICES</b>		\$ 3,062,533	[3] \$ 1,764,498	58%	\$ 1,764,498	58%	\$ 1,764,498	\$ 3,062,533	\$ 1,764,498
Facilities Operations and Programs (1000-4210)		\$ -	\$ 236,641						
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 1,002,198							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP adjustment (allocated)	[5] \$ (1,002,198)							
Willow Pass (4211)		\$ 461,314	\$ 91,000	20%		20%			
	Budget Expenses	\$ 311,394							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 53,476							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 81,373							
	Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (unfunded)	[4] \$ 15,071							
Centre Concord (4212)		\$ 784,316	\$ 280,000	36%		36%			
	Budget Expenses	\$ 568,413							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 54,819							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 148,536							
	Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (unfunded)	[4] \$ 12,548							
Aquatics (4213)		\$ 824,004	\$ 346,857	60%		60%			
	Budget Expenses	\$ 575,131							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 40,598							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 150,292							
	Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (unfunded)	[4] \$ 57,983							
Rec Classes (4214)		\$ 453,593	\$ 285,000	79%		79%			
	Budget Expenses	\$ 359,618							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ -							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 93,975							
Teen (4215)		\$ 84,912	\$ 40,000	62%		62%			
	Budget Expenses	\$ 64,630							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 3,393							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 16,889							
Youth (4216)		\$ 139,634	\$ 100,000	91%		91%			
	Budget Expenses	\$ 109,918							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 992							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 28,724							
Preschool (4217)		\$ 314,760	\$ 385,000	155%		155%			
	Budget Expenses	\$ 248,967							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 734							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 65,059							

CITY OF CONCORD  
PARKS AND RECREATION  
Cost Estimation for Providing Fee Related Activities and Services

DRAFT COPY: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE / CITE

Fee Activity		Cost of Service Activity	Cost Recovery Analysis				Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis		
Description	Current Fee		Existing Cost Recovery Percentage	Recommended Fee Level	Recommended Cost Recovery Percentage	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee	
<b>SPORTS AND EVENTS</b>		\$ 599,406	[3] \$ 395,100	66%	\$ 395,100	66%	\$ 395,100	\$ 599,406	\$ 395,100
Sports and Events (100-4220)									
	Budget Expenses	[2] \$ 357,416							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 148,591							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 93,399							
<b>SENIOR AND SPECIAL RECREATION PROGRAMS</b>		\$ 1,348,621	[3] \$ 260,200	19%	\$ 260,200	19%	\$ 260,200	\$ 1,348,621	\$ 260,200
Senior and Special Recreation Programs (100-4240)									
	Budget Expenses	[2] \$ 688,857							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 469,779							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP 4210 allocation	[5] \$ 180,011							
	Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (unfunded)	[4] \$ 9,974							
<b>DIABLO CREEK GOLF COURSE</b>		\$ 1,382,169	[3] \$ 1,435,605	104%	\$ 1,435,605	104%	\$ 1,435,605	\$ 1,382,169	\$ 1,435,605
Diablo Creek Golf Course (Fund 700)									
	Budget Expenses	[2] \$ 1,342,243							
	Indirect Cost Allocation - Citywide CAP	[1] \$ 39,926							
<b>TOTAL PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES</b>		<b>7,354,089</b>					<b>\$ 4,117,223</b>	<b>\$ 7,354,089</b>	<b>\$ 4,117,223</b>

Notes

[1] Sourced from FY 14/15 Full Cost Allocation Plan prepared by NBS  
[2] Sourced from FY 14/15 Budget Expenses  
[3] Sourced from FY 13/14 Revenue  
[4] Unfunded Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment  
[5] Facilities Operations and Programs (4210) Overhead costs allocated out to programs based on FY 13/14 budget expenses

**APPENDIX B – COMPARATIVE FEE SUREVY**

---

**APPENDIX B.1 - CED – Planning**

**APPENDIX B.2 - CED – Engineering**

**APPENDIX B.3 - CED –Building**

**APPENDIX B.4 - Police**

**APPENDIX B.5 - Administrative Fees**

**APPENDIX B.6 - Parks and Recreation**

City of Concord  
 CED - Planning  
 User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT</b>							
	Individual occupancy	\$ 458.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Tenancy for multiple tenant building*	\$ 1,374.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Carnival	\$ 182.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Home Based Business	\$ 90.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Parking exception	\$ 458.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Secondary Living Unit	\$ 1,132.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Sidewalk Café	\$ 182.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Business license-Planning review	\$ 100.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Animal Permit	\$ 380.00	n/a	n/a	\$ 108.00	n/a	n/a
<b>Annexation</b>							
	Area of 2.5 acres or less	\$ 2,000.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Area larger than 2.5 acres, but not larger than 25 acres	\$ 3,000.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Area larger than 25 acres	\$ 4,000.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Appeal to Planning Commission	\$ 97.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Appeal to City Council	\$ 97.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Appeal of staff interpretation (CMC 122-186)	\$ 97.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Application Acceptability Review</b>							
	Acceptability Meetings (per hour)	\$ 141.00	\$ 180.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Building Move</b>							
	Relocation Application	\$ 1,132.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Condition Compliance</b>							
	Per hour	\$ 141.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Design Review (CMC 122-106 (a))</b>							
	Administrative Design Review	\$ 423.00	n/a	\$ 500.00	n/a	\$ 350.00	n/a
	Sign - if not part of project review	\$ 705.00	180 per hour	\$ 900.00	\$ 500.00	n/a	n/a
	Residential development of four (4) units or less; office building to twenty-five hundred (2,500) sq. ft.; commercial and industrial building to ten thousand (10,000) sq. ft.	\$ 705.00	n/a	\$500-2000	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Residential development of five (5) to twenty-four (24) units; office building from two thousand five hundred and one (2,501) to ten thousand (10,000) sq. ft.; commercial and industrial building from ten thousand and one (10,001) to twenty thousand (20,000) sq. ft.	\$ 1,410.00	n/a	actual cost \$6,600 deposit	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Other development including development with outdoor operations	\$ 2,820.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus an additional fee computed on an hourly basis where review costs exceed the base fee	\$ 141.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Amendment	\$ 423.00	Actual cost	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Extension (CMC 122-184 (a))	\$ 378.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Sign - Administrative Design Review	\$ 598.00	\$180 per hour	n/a	n/a	\$ 700.00	n/a
<b>Development Agreement, Disposition and Development Agreement</b>							
	Development Agreement Application	\$ 6,204.00	n/a	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 2,500.00	n/a	n/a
	Development Agreement Amendment	\$ 2,831.00	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,000.00	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
CED - Planning  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
	Review of development proposal by Planning Commission prior to approval of Disposition and Development Agreement	\$ 423.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Miscellaneous</b>						n/a
	Condition Compliance (per hour)	\$ 141.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Environmental Documents</b>						n/a
	Initial environmental impact analysis preparation	\$ 2,961.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	Full cost + 25%	n/a
	Negative declaration preparation	\$ 1,410.00	\$180 per hour	actual cost	n/a	\$ 1,650.00	n/a
	Environmental Impact Report (per hour)	At Cost	\$180 per hour	consultant cost + 25% for city admin	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Geologic Review (per Alquist-Pirola Act)	20%	n/a	\$ 0.25	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus Administrative fee (percent of cost)	At Cost	n/a	At cost	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting (CMC 122-956)	20%	n/a	\$ 0.25	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Finding of Public Convenience and Necessity (FOPCN)</b>						
	Finding of Public Convenience and Necessity (FOPCN)	\$ 1,581.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>General/Redevelopment Plan</b>						n/a
	General and/or Redevelopment Plan Amendment	\$ 5,076.00	\$180 per hour	n/a	n/a	\$ 4,600.00	n/a
	General and/or Redevelopment Plan Consistency Ruling	\$ 716.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	For plan amendment resulting in change to plan text or diagram the cost for the necessary change(s), including replacement pages, plans and maps, shall be borne by the project applicant initiating the amendment (per hour)	At Cost	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Heritage Tree</b>						
	Designation (per parcel) (CMC 114-62)	\$ 188.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Permit for Removal (CMC 114-67 (a)(4))	\$ 945.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 25.00
	<b>Other Community Development Fees</b>						
	Abatement Hearing (by the Zoning Administrator)	\$ 282.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Street Name Change	\$ 423.00	n/a	\$ 173.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Replacement and installation of street name signs	At Cost	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Preliminary Application*</b>						
	Minor subdivision, Residential, one to four lots/units	\$ 700.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Major subdivision, Residential						
	Five to 100 lots/units	\$ 1,120.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	101 lots/units or more	\$ 1,410.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Commercial/Industrial use						
	One building	\$ 705.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	More than one building	\$ 1,410.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Subdivision/Map Act/Property Rights</b>						
	Tentative Maps (entitlement phase)		\$180 per hour				
	Major subdivision Application	\$ 7,050.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 13,000.00	n/a
	Plus per lot	\$ 282.00	\$ 180.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Amendment to Major Subdivision	\$ 1,974.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Extension to Major Subdivision	\$ 755.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Minor Subdivision Application	\$ 4,230.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 4,000.00	n/a
	Plus per lot	\$ 282.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
CED - Planning  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
	Amendment to Minor Subdivision	\$ 705.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Extension to Minor Subdivision	\$ 423.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Lot line adjustment (between 2 parcels)	\$ 846.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Parcel merge (between 2 parcels)	\$ 846.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Application for vacation or abandonment of property rights	\$ 564.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Use Permit</b>							
	Ground sign or Accessory Building Review	\$ 1,269.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Residential development of four (4) units or less; office building to twenty-five hundred (2,500) sq. ft.; commercial and industrial building to ten thousand (10,000) sq. ft.	\$ 3,102.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,500.00	n/a
	Residential development of five (5) to twenty-four (24) units; office building from two thousand five hundred and one (2,501) to ten thousand (10,000) sq. ft.; commercial and industrial building from ten thousand and one (10,001) to twenty thousand (20,000) sq. ft.	\$ 4,935.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Other development including any development with outdoor operations	\$ 5,640.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Amendment (CMC 122-73)	\$ 3,102.00	n/a	\$ 2,200.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Extension (CMC 122-184)	\$ 2,115.00	n/a	\$ 1,168.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Entertainment Permit	\$ 2,820.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Variance (CMC 122-54)</b>							
	Related to existing single family residence only, not including a new subdivision or construction of a new unit	\$ 1,410.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 500.00	n/a
	Other variance	\$ 2,820.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus per each affected parcel	\$ 1,410.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Reasonable Accommodation (CMC 122-215)	\$ 141.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Extension (CMC 122-184)	\$ 423.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Vendor Permit (CMC 122-53)</b>	\$ 423.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Zoning Administrator Permit (CMC 122-53)</b>							
	Residential development of four (4) units or less; office building to twenty-five hundred (2,500) sq. ft.; commercial and industrial building to ten thousand (10,000) sq. ft. and for small collection recycling facility	\$ 1,269.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Residential development of five (5) to twenty-four (24) units; office building from two thousand five hundred and one (2,501) to ten thousand (10,000) sq. ft.; and commercial and industrial building from ten thousand and one (10,001) to twenty thousand (20,000) sq. ft.	\$ 1,974.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Other development including development with outdoor operations	\$ 3,243.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Related to an individual single family residence only; e.g., a permit for an 8ft. wall/fence	\$ 353.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Child care facility (large family day care home)*	\$ 705.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 800.00	n/a
	*Engineering review and the fee may be waived for child care facilities (large family day care homes) for 7 to 12 children if there are no perceived impacts that require review		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
 CED - Planning  
 User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
	Home-based Business (client variance)	\$ 458.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Telecommunications facility	\$ 2,397.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Amendment (CMC 122-73)	\$ 472.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Extension (CMC 122-184 (a))	\$ 378.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Zoning Amendment (Rezoning)</b>							
	Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) - Planned District Only (CMC 122-686)	\$ 5,147.00	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	n/a
	PDP Amendment						
	Significant (CMC 122-686)	\$ 2,831.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Minor (CMC 122-686)	\$ 1,416.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Rezoning application (CMC 122-686)	\$ 6,434.00	\$ 180.00	n/a	n/a	\$ 3,000.00	n/a
	Request for text amendment	\$ 6,434.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
CED - Engineering  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
<b>Encroachment Permit (CMC 90-234)</b>							
	Permit Issuance and Processing	\$ 83.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 69.00	n/a	\$ 140.00	\$ 102.00
	Application Processing fee (1-hour minimum)(per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Inspection fee</b>							
	Minimum (per hour)	\$ 165.00	\$ 160.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Curb and gutter, sidewalk (not in addition to major construction inspection fee) (each 50 l.f.)						
	Minimum or	\$ 330.00	n/a	\$.0800 per hour	n/a	n/a	\$ 211.00
	Additional above minimum (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Driveway						
	Minimum or	\$ 495.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Additional above minimum (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Building Move -- encroachment permit	\$ 660.00	n/a	n/a	\$ 400.00	n/a	n/a
	Storage or placement of materials in right-of-way	\$ 22.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Sewer lateral in street right-of-way or easement	\$ 660.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Other inspection						
	Minimum (per hour) (one hour minimum) or	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Additional above minimum (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Sidewalk cafe	\$ 495.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Reinspection (for reasons such as work not ready for a requested inspection, and failed or improper work done without an inspection which must be redone) (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Special inspection requests, other than regular business hours (2 hours minimum) (per hour)	\$ 248.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Specialty inspection (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Materials sampling and compaction testing (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Special materials testing	At Cost	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus admin fee	\$ 0.20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Sewer air Test and Televising (per call out)	\$ 1,650.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Special Administration						
	Agreement processing not related to subdivisions (per agreement)	\$ 1,458.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Acceptance of new public improvements	825.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Project archiving and closeout (major projects only) (per hour)	165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Flood Zone/FEMA/Drainage</b>							
	Flood Zone Verification Certificate	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 200.00	n/a
	Flood Zone Verification Certificate (requiring additional analysis due to location of structure relative to floodplain)	\$ 330.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Flood Elevation Certificate	\$ 330.00	\$ 150.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Flood Zone Construction Permit	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	FEMA application review for LOMA's, CLOMA's, LOMR's, CLOMR's, etc. (minimum)	\$ 825.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus additional at hourly rate, if needed (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Drainage investigations (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Grading Permit</b>							
	Application Processing fee (one hour minimum)(per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Grading Plan Review					2.5%	
	Single lot in (a non-hillside) location up to 100 cubic yards	495.00	n/a	\$ 138.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	101-1,000 cubic yards, for the first 100 cubic yards	660.00	n/a	\$ 711.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus for each additional 100 cubic yards or fraction thereof	83.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1,001-10,000 cubic yards, for the first 1,000 cubic yards	1,485.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
CED - Engineering  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof	165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	10,001-100,000 cubic yards, for the first 10,000 cubic yards	2,970.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof	165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Over 100,000 cubic yards (each 10,000 cu yds.)	165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Additional document review, including SWPPP's and Soils report (per hour)						
	Geotechnical SWPPP	\$ 165.00	n/a	\$ 137.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Grading Permit Inspection</b>						
	Single lot in (a non-hillside) location up to 100 cubic yards	495.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	101-1,000 cubic yards, for the first 100 cubic yards	660.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus for each additional 100 cubic yards or fraction thereof	83.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1,001-10,000 cubic yards, for the first 1,000 cubic yards	1,485.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof	165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	10,001-100,000 cubic yards, for the first 10,000 cubic yards	3,300.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof	165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Over 100,000 cubic yards (Not to exceed 9% of grading cost)(per hour)	165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Pad certification	83.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Stockpile and erosion control monitoring (per calendar day)	22.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus additional effort (per hour)	165.00	n/a	\$ 137.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Off-Site Street Improvement Program (OSIP) (CMC 78-154)</b>						
	Fee Increase Under Review	3,251.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Single family unit (per dwelling unit)	1,626.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Secondary living unit						
	Multi family unit, including condominium and townhouse (per dwelling unit)	2,624.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Commercial (per gross sq. ft.)	8.81	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Office (per gross sq. ft.)	7.04	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Industrial (per gross sq. ft.)	2.98	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Mini-storage (per gross sq. ft.)	1.51	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Preliminary Application*</b>						
	Minor subdivision, Residential, one to four lots/units	\$ 825.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Major subdivision, Residential						
	Five to 100 lots/units	\$ 1,320.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	101 lots/units or more	\$ 1,815.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Commercial/Industrial use						
	One building	\$ 825.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	More than one building	\$ 1,650.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Sidewalk Repair Administrative Fee</b>	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 211.00
	<b>Subdivision/Map Act/Property Rights</b>						
	Tentative Maps (entitlement phase)						
	Major subdivision Application	\$ 2,640.00	n/a	\$ 2,864.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus per lot	\$ 165.00	n/a	\$ 10.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Amendment to Major Subdivision	\$ 990.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Extension to Major Subdivision	\$ 330.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Minor Subdivision Application	\$ 1,650.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus per lot	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Amendment to Minor Subdivision	\$ 495.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Extension to Minor Subdivision	\$ 330.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Major Subdivision Map (recorded map process)</b>						
	Final Map Review	\$ 2,640.00	n/a	\$ 2,864.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus per lot	\$ 165.00	n/a	\$ 30.00	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
CED - Engineering  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
	Final Map filing	\$ 1,650.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Improvement Plan Review (per lot)	\$ 1,155.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,800.00	n/a
	Acceptance of Improvement and dedications	\$ 3,300.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Amendment to Subdivision Agreement	\$ 3,300.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Charges for Inspection of Construction						
	Percent of cost of improvements or	9%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Minimum (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Minor Subdivision Map (recorded map process)					\$ 1,500.00	n/a
	Parcel Map Review	\$ 1,650.00	n/a	\$ 1,449.00	n/a	\$ 800.00	n/a
	Plus per lot	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Parcel Map Filing	\$ 1,650.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Improvement Plan Review (per lot)	\$ 1,650.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Acceptance of dedications	\$ 1,650.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Acceptance of improvements	\$ 825.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Amendment of Improvement Agreement	\$ 825.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Charges for Inspection of Construction						
	Percent of cost of improvements or	9%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Minimum (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Development Plan Review and additional plan checking as required, due to substantial plan alterations (per hour)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Special engineering analysis	At Cost	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Plus Administrative fee (percent of cost)	9%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Charge for Installation of New Street Monuments (each)	\$ 330.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Charge for new lot creation (per lot)	\$ 330.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Lot line adjustment (between 2 parcels)	\$ 825.00	n/a	\$ 692.00	\$ 1,500.00	n/a	n/a
	Each additional parcel above 2 (per parcel)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Parcel merge (between 2 parcels)	\$ 825.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Each additional parcel above 2 (per parcel)	\$ 165.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Certificate of Compliance	\$ 825.00	\$180 per hour	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Certification of Correction Review	\$ 825.00	n/a	\$ 137.00	n/a	\$ 350.00	n/a
	Minor Subdivision	\$ 330.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Major Subdivision	\$ 660.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Application for vacation or abandonment of property rights	\$ 990.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Acceptance of easements and dedications						
	Acceptance by City Council	\$ 1,650.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Acceptance by City Staff	\$ 825.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Reversion to acreage or record of survey filing fee	\$ 495.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Assessment District Reapportionment (CMC 78-32)						
	Application Fee	\$ 82.50	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Review - Hearing Method	\$ 9,900.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Review - Alternative Method	\$ 495.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
 CED - Building  
 User Fee Study Fee Comparison

PROJECT	ASSUMPTIONS	CURRENT FEE			RECOMMENDED FEE			DIFFERENCE
		PLAN CHECK FEE	INSPECTION FEE	TOTAL PERMIT FEE	PLAN CHECK FEE	INSPECTION FEE	TOTAL PERMIT FEE	
New commercial retail, trades included, 20,000 s.f., \$1,400,000 valuation	M occupancy group. Type V (B). Minimum document imaging fees only.	\$ 10,878	\$ 27,196	\$ 38,074	\$ 10,390	\$ 19,346	\$ 29,736	\$ (8,338)
Commercial tenant improvement, non-structural, 2,500 s.f., \$150,000 valuation	B occupancy group. Type V (B). Minimum document imaging fees only.	\$ 1,176	\$ 2,940	\$ 4,116	\$ 1,969	\$ 2,525	\$ 4,494	\$ 378
new custom single family dwelling, 3,000 s.f., \$400,000 valuation	400 s.f. garage. R3 occupancy group. Type V (B). Minimum document imaging fees only.	\$ 2,095	\$ 5,237	\$ 7,332	\$ 5,696	\$ 8,209	\$ 13,905	\$ 6,573
residential addition, 450 s.f., \$75,000 valuation	R3 occupancy group. Type V(B). Minimum document imaging fees only.	\$ 588	\$ 1,470	\$ 2,058	\$ 1,071	\$ 1,222	\$ 2,293	\$ 235
residential remodel (typical kitchen or bathroom project), 200 s.f., \$15,000 valuation	Minimum document imaging fees only.	\$ 184	\$ 459	\$ 643	\$ 166	\$ 246	\$ 412	\$ (231)
residential reroof permit	\$10,000 valuation & 2200 square feet.	\$ -	\$ 449	\$ 449	\$ -	\$ 195	\$ 195	\$ (254)
window/door replacement permit	\$3,000 valuation & replacing 6 windows & 1 sliding door.	\$ -	\$ 219	\$ 219	\$ -	\$ 106	\$ 106	\$ (113)
water heater permit	\$1,000 valuation.	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	\$ -	\$ 101	\$ 101	\$ 9
electrical service upgrade permit	\$1,000 valuation.	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	\$ -	\$ 101	\$ 101	\$ 9
HVAC replacement permit	\$2,000 valuation	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	\$ -	\$ 101	\$ 101	\$ 9
New HVAC installation permit	\$8,000 valuation.	\$ -	\$ 276	\$ 276	\$ -	\$ 130	\$ 130	\$ (146)

City of Concord  
Police  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
<b>Alarm Systems</b>							
	Alarm system use permit fee (CMC 18-93(e))	\$ 40.00	\$ 75.00	--	\$ 36.00	n/a	n/a
	False alarm service charges (CMC 18-95)					n/a	n/a
	False alarm 4, 5, and 6 in any 60-day period	\$ 135.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 68.50	\$ 75.00	n/a	n/a
	False alarm 9, 10, 11 in any 360-day period	\$ 135.00	\$ 110.00	\$ 68.50	\$ 75.00	n/a	n/a
	False alarm 7 and 8 in any 60-day period	\$ 270.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 68.50	\$ 75.00	n/a	n/a
	False alarm 12 and 13 in any 360-day period	\$ 270.00	\$ 175.00	\$ 68.50	\$ 75.00	n/a	n/a
	Each additional false alarm after the 8th in any 60-day period	\$ 401.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Each additional false alarm after the 13th in any 360-day period	\$ 401.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Clearance Letters</b>							
	Fee for resident	\$ 30.00	n/a	\$ 32.00	\$ 35.00	n/a	n/a
	Fee for non-resident	\$ 45.00	n/a	\$ 32.00	\$ 35.00	n/a	n/a
<b>Concealed Weapons Dealer Permit (P&amp;P 81) (confirm weapons dealer)</b>							
	Initial fee	\$ 520.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 264.00
	Annual renewal of existing license	\$ 115.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Emergency Response Cost Recovery</b>							
	Recovery of expenses for police emergency response as permitted by Government Code, Title 5, Article 8, Sections 53150 - 53158. Not to exceed \$12,000 per incident (per hour)	Actual Costs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Emergency Response Administrative Fee	\$ 100.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Fingerprint Services (Non-criminal)</b>							
	Fingerprint processing fee	\$ 41.00	\$ 32.00	\$ 41.50	n/a	\$ 25.00	\$ 44.00
	Rolling fee	\$ 30.00	\$ 32.00	\$ -	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Concealed weapons permits</b>							
	City processing fee	\$ 155.00	\$ 100.00	n/a	\$ 100.00	\$ 277.00	n/a
	Annual renewal City processing fee	\$ 41.00	\$ 100.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Gun Storage Services Pursuant to Court Orders</b>							
	Administration Processing Fee per incident	\$ 60.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Storage Fee per month (or any fraction thereof) per gun	\$ 5.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Police reports</b>							
	Per copy - public records	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10	n/a	\$ 0.10	n/a
<b>Review of Local Criminal History</b>							
	Summary information by individuals who may have records with Police Department (non-refundable)	\$ 45.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 37.50	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Second Hand Dealer</b>							
	Administrative processing fee (Covers the Two Year Permit Period)	\$ 752.00	\$ 195.00	n/a	\$ 883.00	n/a	\$ 267.00
<b>Vehicle Abatement</b>							
	Administration Fee - Vehicle Abatement Procedure	\$ 105.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Vehicle Identification Numbers</b>							
	VIN Verification charge (individuals only)	\$ 50.00	n/a	\$ 85.50	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Vehicle Inspection and Citation Sign Off</b>							
	Concord Resident	\$ 15.00	n/a	no charge	n/a	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00
	Non-Concord Resident	\$ 20.00	n/a	\$ 36.50	n/a	\$ 45.00	n/a

City of Concord  
 Bus, Prof Trade fees  
 User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
	<b>Administrative Processing Fee for Business Licenses or Permits</b>						
	Administrative processing fee renewal of license or permits	\$ 18.00	n/a	\$ 39.13	\$ 30.00	n/a	\$ 50.00
	Administrative processing fee issue of new license or permits	\$ 18.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Business License Exemption Audit Fee	\$ 277.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Card room Permits</b>						
	Application fees (CMC 6-121,(d)(12))	No Fee	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Door-to-Door Solicitation Permits</b>						
	Application and Investigation Fee	\$ 27.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Entertainment Permits (CMC 6-193(8))</b>						
	Application fee	\$ 150.00	\$ 100.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 149.00
	<b>Escort Service Permits (CMC 18-121 - 18-130)</b>						
	License (owner)	\$ 530.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Massage Parlors, Out-Call Massage Services, and Massage Therapy Technician Permits</b>						
	Massage parlor permit fee (CMC 18-277,(b))	\$ 138.00	\$ 132.00	\$ 212.75	n/a	n/a	\$ 170.00
	Massage Therapy Technician permit fee (CMC 18-278(b))	\$ 72.00	\$ 82.00	\$ 141.75	n/a	n/a	\$ 340.00
	<b>Tobacco Retailers License (CMC 38-70)</b>						
	Administrative and Enforcement Fee	\$ 175.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Hearing Fee	\$ 375.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Re-Inspection Fee	\$ 120.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
Administrative Fees  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord - Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
<b>Appeals to City Council</b>							
	Appeals requiring public notice (CMC 2-52)	\$ 138.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Appeals where public notice is not required (CMC 2-53)	\$ 48.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Copies of Public Records/Information</b>							
	Photo copy of public record - page size not to exceed 11" x 17"						
	Each page	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.10		\$ 0.25	\$ 0.10
	Print copy of public record - oversized page exceeding 11" x 17" such as maps, drawings, plans, etc.						
	Each page or actual cost	Actual Costs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Extract of document and certification (each page)	\$ 4.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Certifying documents, Live Certificates (each document)	\$ 26.00	n/a	\$ 22.97	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Business License Listings</b>							
	Electronic copy of business license list	\$ 45.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 26.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 35.00
	Business license list copied to CD	\$ 50.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 39.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 50.00
<b>Housing Rehabilitation Loan Fees</b>							
	Loan Origination Fee	\$ 85.00	\$ 280.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,500.00
	Plus other loan administrative costs. This includes but is not limited to title, lien, registration, appraisal, inspections and other loan processing costs	Actual Costs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Inspection/Abatement Warrants</b>							
	Fee charged per warrant	\$ 396.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Mobile home Rent Review Fees</b>							
	Mobile home Parks	Actual Costs	n/a	n/a	\$ 665.00	n/a	n/a
<b>Notice of Intent to Circulate Municipal Initiative Petition</b>							
	Fee due when petition filed	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Past Due Receivables</b>							
	A late charge for past due receivables (per month) (of amount due)	3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Postage and Handling</b>							
	Plus postage (actual cost)	actual cost	n/a	actual cost	actual cost	actual cost	actual cost
<b>Rental of Television Facilities (City Council Chamber)</b>							
	For activities not related to the City of Concord						
	First hour	\$ 168.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Each additional hour or fraction thereof	\$ 84.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Returned Checks</b>							
	First Returned Check	\$ 25.00	\$ 40.00	na	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00
	Subsequent Returned Checks	\$ 35.00	n/a	na	\$ 30.00	na	\$ 35.00
<b>Subordination Agreement to facilitate Refinance</b>							
	Per refinance	\$ 225.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 200.00
<b>Tapes of Public Meetings</b>							
	Copy of DVD (per disk)	\$ 24.00	\$ 11.00	\$ 11.48	\$ 41.00	n/a	n/a
	Requests for multiple copies will be referred to local vendor(s) equipped to provide such services	Actual Costs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
Parks and Recreation  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
<b>Adult Sports</b>							
	Softball League						
	Summer						
	Per team	\$ 815.00	n/a	\$ 665.00	n/a	\$ 547.00	n/a
	Fall						
	Per team	\$ 530.00	n/a	\$ 665.00	n/a	\$ 547.00	n/a
<b>Aquatics</b>							
	Recreational Swimming						
	Concord Community Pool						
	Age 18 years or older						
	Single Admission - Resident	\$ 5.25	\$ 4.50	\$ 7	n/a	\$ 5.00	n/a
	Single Admission - Non-Resident	\$ 6.25	\$ 6.50	\$ 7	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (15 swims) - Resident	\$ 66.00	\$60-80	\$ 55.20	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (15 swims) - Non-Resident	\$ 76.00	\$60-80	\$ 60.70	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (30 swims) - Resident	\$ 123.00	-	\$ 130.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (30 swims) - Non-Resident	\$ 133.00	-	\$ 143.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (45 swims) - Resident	\$ 171.00	-	\$ 194.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (45 swims) - Non-Resident	\$ 181.00	-	\$ 214.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Age 3 to 17 years						
	Single Admission - Resident	\$ 4.50	\$4-6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Single Admission - Non-Resident	\$ 5.25	\$4-6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (15 swims) - Resident	\$ 58.00	\$52-76	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (15 swims) - Non-Resident	\$ 66.00	\$52-77	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Age 2 and under	No Charge	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 3.00	n/a
	Family Swim Pass, up to a family of four - Resident	\$ 275.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 374.20	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Family Swim Pass, up to a family of four - Non-Resident	\$ 295.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 411.60	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Each additional member over four in number - Resident	\$ 18.00	n/a	\$ 74.70	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Each additional member over four in number - Non-Resident	\$ 20.00	n/a	\$ 82.30	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Lap Swimming</b>							
	Concord Community Pool						
	Single Admission - Resident	\$ 5.25	\$6-12	\$ 4.00	\$ 72.00	n/a	n/a
	Single Admission - Non-Resident	\$ 6.25	n/a	\$ 4.00	\$ 82.00	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (15 swims) - Resident	\$ 66.00	n/a	\$ 51.20	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (15 swims) - Non-Resident	\$ 76.00	n/a	\$ 56.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (30 swims) - Resident	\$ 123.00	n/a	\$ 96.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (30 swims) - Non-Resident	\$ 133.00	n/a	\$ 105.60	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (45 swims) - Resident	\$ 171.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Swim Card (45 swims) - Non-Resident	\$ 181.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Monthly Swim Pass - Resident	\$ 70.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Monthly Swim Pass -Non-Resident	\$ 75.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Special Rentals</b>							
	Concord Community Pool						
	Swim Meets						
	Daily Pool Rental (March - October)	\$ 1,750.00	\$1600-2000	\$ 1,027	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Daily Pool Rental November - February)	\$ 1,250.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Picnic Pavilion / Birthday Parties (per event)						
	Weekday	\$ 215.00	\$50-100	\$30-33	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Weekend	\$ 260.00	\$50-101	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
Parks and Recreation  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
<b>Athletic Fields</b>							
	Annual One-Time Registration Fee - Leagues	\$ 75.00	n/a				
	Cancellation/Reschedule/Permit Changes	\$ 25.00	n/a	\$ 30.28	\$ 50.00	n/a	n/a
	Reserved Use Fee - Resident or Concord Based Non-Profit / School						
	Non Profit Youth Programs (per field per hour)	\$ 7.00	n/a	\$ 12	\$15-20	n/a	n/a
	Non Profit Adult Groups/Programs (per field per hour)	\$ 35.00	\$27-34	n/a	\$20-50	n/a	n/a
	School Programs (per field per day)	\$ 30.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Reserved Use Fee - Non Resident / Commercial / For Profit General Sports Athletic Field (per field per hour)	\$ 40.00	\$32-39	n/a	n/a	\$ 44	n/a
	League Tournament Fees (Applies when entrance fees are collected for tournament participation)						
	Half Day (8am - 2 pm or 2 pm - 30 minutes past sunset) (per field)	\$ 150.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Full Day (12 hours or any use after 2 pm) (per field)	\$ 250.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<u>Willow Pass Community Park (per field per hour)</u>	\$ 35.00	n/a	n/a	\$15 Memorial Field		
	<u>Baldwin Park Bocce Courts</u>						
	Reserved Use Fee - Resident (per court per hour)	\$ 15.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Reserved Use Fee - Non-Resident (per court per hour)	\$ 25.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Refundable Damage Deposit	\$ 200.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>City Facility Alcohol Use Permit</b>							
	Groups or individuals using City parks	\$ 75.00	\$60-100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Use Deposit (refundable, depending upon condition of facility)	\$ 200.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Community Center Rental Fees</b>							
<b>Centre Concord</b>							
<b>Weekend Rentals (Friday through Sunday):</b>							
	Friday and Sunday 7-hour block of time Full Ballroom (7 hours)	\$ 1,700.00	\$90-160 per hour	\$140-240 5hr		n/a	\$ 208.00
	Saturday 10-hour block of time Full Ballroom (10 hours)	\$ 2,500.00	\$125-225 per hour	\$1120-2080		n/a	n/a
	Full Ballroom additional hourly rate	\$ 200.00	n/a	\$140-220	\$ 239.00	n/a	n/a
	1/3 Ballroom (per hour)	\$ 140.00	n/a	\$63-117	\$ 84.00	n/a	n/a
	2/3 Ballroom (per hour)	\$ 180.00	n/a	\$67-124	\$ 134.00	n/a	n/a
	Activity Center (per hour)	\$ 120.00	n/a	\$84-159	\$ 74.00	\$55-93	n/a
	Ballroom refundable damage deposit	\$ 1,000.00	n/a	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	n/a	n/a
	Activity Center refundable damage deposit	\$ 500.00	n/a	\$ 300.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 547.00	n/a
	Alcohol Permit	\$ 75.00	\$60-100	n/a	\$ 100.00	\$ 27.00	\$ 150.00
<b>Weekday Rentals (Monday through Thursday):</b>							
	Classroom (per hour)	\$ 35.00	n/a	\$30-56	\$ 70.00	n/a	n/a
	All day	\$ 250.00	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1/3 Ballroom (per hour)	\$ 90.00	n/a	\$26-62	n/a	n/a	n/a
	All day	\$ 525.00	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2/3 Ballroom (per hour)	\$ 110.00	n/a	\$25-58	n/a	n/a	n/a
	All day	\$ 675.00	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Full Ballroom (per hour)	\$ 140.00	n/a	\$50-117	n/a	n/a	n/a
	All day	\$ 825.00	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Activity Center (per hour)	\$ 75.00	n/a	\$53-124	\$ 100	n/a	n/a
	All day	\$ 475.00	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Kitchen Rental (per hour)	\$ 30.00	n/a	\$25-36 per hour	\$ 45.00	\$ 82.00	n/a

City of Concord  
Parks and Recreation  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
	Alcohol Permit	\$ 75.00	n/a	n/a	\$ 100.00	\$ 27.00	\$ 150.00
	<b>Willow Pass Center</b>						
	<b>Weekend Rentals:</b>						
	Main Hall (per hour) (Friday evening and Saturday)	\$ 170.00	n/a	\$75-141	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Main Hall (per hour) (Sunday)	\$ 135.00	n/a	\$60-112	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Meeting rooms (per hour) (Friday evening and Saturday)	\$ 45.00	n/a	\$49-91	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Alcohol Permit	\$ 75.00	n/a	n/a	\$ 100.00	\$ 27.00	n/a
	<b>Weekday Rentals:</b>						
	Main Hall (per hour) (Monday - Friday before 5pm)	\$ 75.00	n/a	\$54-101	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Meeting rooms (per hour) (Monday - Friday before 5pm)	\$ 32.00	n/a	\$35-65	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Main Hall Weekday Package 9 hours	\$ 610.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Refundable Damage Deposit - Main Hall	\$ 750.00	\$100-1000	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	n/a	n/a
	Refundable Damage Deposit - Meeting Rooms	\$ 250.00	n/a	\$ 300.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Alcohol Permit	\$ 75.00	\$60-100	n/a	\$ 100.00	\$ 27.00	\$ 150.00
	<b>Group Picnics</b>						
	Resident						
	Hillcrest, Meadow Homes, Ygnacio Valley	\$ 100.00	\$ 85.00	\$58-107 Apple Hill	\$ 75.00	\$ 164.00	n/a
	Baldwin, Newhall	\$ 165.00	n/a	\$58-107 Balfour Park	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Concord Community Park #1	\$ 240.00	n/a	\$29-53 (25 capacity	\$100 capacity 40	n/a	n/a
	Concord Community Park #2	\$ 350.00	n/a	\$29-53 (25 capacity	\$110 Capacity 50	n/a	n/a
	Non-Resident		n/a	\$ 45.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Hillcrest, Meadow Homes, Ygnacio Valley	\$ 140.00	n/a	\$42-79 25 capacity	\$ 125.00	n/a	n/a
	Baldwin, Newhall	\$ 195.00	n/a	\$29-53 25 capacity	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Concord Community Park #1	\$ 280.00	n/a	\$29-53 per day	\$100 capacity 40	n/a	n/a
	Concord Community Park #2	\$ 390.00	n/a	\$124-231 100	\$110 Capacity 50	n/a	n/a
	Refundable Damage Deposit	\$ 200.00	\$100-300	Capacity	\$ 500.00	\$ 164.00	n/a
	Motion Picture Permit Processing						
	Application filing fee for permit for filming of motion pictures for commercial and non-commercial purposes (non-refundable)	\$ 250.00	\$100-500	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Pre-School</b>						
	Two days per week (monthly installment)		\$1500-4100 per school year				
	Resident	\$ 125.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Non-Resident	\$ 130.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Three days per week (monthly installment)						
	Resident	\$ 189.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Non-Resident	\$ 194.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Registration Fee (non-refundable)	\$ 35.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Program Cancellation Fee	\$ 75.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	<b>Special Events</b>						
	Non-refundable Application/Permit Fee	\$ 250.00	\$ 49.60	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

City of Concord  
Parks and Recreation  
User Fee Study - Fee Comparison

No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Walnut Creek	Brentwood	Antioch	Pittsburg	Dublin
No	Fee Description	Concord- Current Fee	Camp Berkeley Tuolumne	Camp Mather	San Jose Family Camp		
<b>Camp Concord</b>							
	Daily Rates (Summer 2012) - Family Campers (15% discount for Concord Residents)						
	Age 16 and over	\$ 99.00	\$ 114.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 63.00		
	Age 11 to 15	\$ 77.00	\$ 77.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 52.00		
	Age 6 to 10	\$ 56.00	\$ 77.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 52.00		
	Age 3 to 5	\$ 33.00	\$ 58.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 52.00		
	Age 2 and under	No Fee	No Fee	No fee	No fee		
	Off-Season (August through June) (fee based on number in group, nights and meals)						
	Adults - Age 13 and over	25.00 - 75.00	\$ 114.00	\$ 36.00	\$ 53.00		
	Children - Age 5 to 12 years	25.00 - 75.00	\$ 77.00	\$ 19.00	\$ 42.00		
No	Fee Description	Diablo Creek Golf Course (Concord)	Boundry Oaks (Walnut Creek)	Lone Tree (Antioch)	Delta View (Pittsburg)	Las Positas (Livermore)	
<b>Golf Course</b>							
	Daily Green Fees						
	Weekdays - Monday through Friday						
	9 holes (resident)	\$ 19.00	\$ 21.00	\$ 29.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 21.00	
	9 holes (non-resident)	\$ 21.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 29.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 23.00	
	18 holes (resident)	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.00	\$ 43.00	\$ 27.00	\$ 38.00	
	18 holes (non-resident)	\$ 32.00	\$ 32.00	\$ 43.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 38.00	
	Super Twilight (4 hours before dusk)	\$ 15.00	\$ 21.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 18.00	
	Seniors (resident)	\$ 21.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 38.00	\$ 17.00	\$ 28.00	
	Seniors (non-resident)	\$ 24.00	\$ 26.00	\$ 38.00	\$ 17.00	\$ 28.00	
	Junior (18 years & under) (resident)	\$ 14.00	\$ 21.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 17.00	
	Junior (18 years & under) (non-resident)	\$ 16.00	\$ 26.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 17.00	
	Weekends - Saturday, Sunday and Holidays						
	9 holes (resident)	\$ 22.00	\$ 24.00	\$ 32.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 22.00	
	9 holes (non-resident)	\$ 25.00	\$ 29.00	\$ 32.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 26.00	
	18 holes (resident)	\$ 35.00	\$ 38.00	\$ 53.00	\$ 41.00	\$ 48.00	
	18 holes (non-resident)	\$ 41.00	\$ 44.00	\$ 53.00	\$ 46.00	\$ 48.00	
	Super Twilight (4 hours before dusk)	\$ 18.00	\$ 27.00	\$ 38.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 20.00	
	Junior (18 years & under) (resident)	\$ 16.00	\$ 17.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 24.00	
	Junior (18 years & under) (non-resident)	\$ 18.00	\$ 23.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 24.00	

**ATTACHMENT B**

**SAMPLE FEE COST RECOVERY POLICIES**

**CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO**

**CITY OF SACRAMENTO**

**CITY OF PALO ALTO**

*service* nature of the program or activity. The use of general-purpose revenues is appropriate for community-wide services, while user fees are appropriate for services that are of special benefit to easily identified individuals or groups.

2. ***Service Recipient Versus Service Driver.*** After considering community-wide versus special benefit of the service, the concept of *service recipient* versus *service driver* should also be considered. For example, it could be argued that the applicant is not the beneficiary of the City's development review efforts: the community is the primary beneficiary. However, the applicant is the *driver* of development review costs, and as such, cost recovery from the applicant is appropriate.
3. ***Effect of Pricing on the Demand for Services.*** The level of cost recovery and related pricing of services can significantly affect the demand and subsequent level of services provided. At full cost recovery, this has the specific advantage of ensuring that the City is providing services for which there is genuinely a market that is not overly-stimulated by artificially low prices.

Conversely, high levels of cost recovery will negatively impact the delivery of services to lower income groups. This negative feature is especially pronounced, and works against public policy, if the services are specifically targeted to low income groups.

4. ***Feasibility of Collection and Recovery.*** Although it may be determined that a high level of cost recovery may be appropriate for specific services, it may be impractical or too costly to establish a system to identify and charge the user. Accordingly, the feasibility of assessing and collecting charges should also be considered in developing user fees, especially if significant program costs are intended to be financed from that source.

## **USER FEE COST RECOVERY GOALS**

### **A. Ongoing Review**

Fees will be reviewed and updated on an ongoing basis to ensure that they keep pace with changes in the cost-of-living as well as changes in methods or levels of service delivery.

In implementing this goal, a comprehensive analysis of City costs and fees should be made at least every five years. In the interim, fees will be adjusted by annual changes in the Consumer Price Index. Fees may be adjusted during this interim period based on supplemental analysis whenever there have been significant changes in the method, level or cost of service delivery.

### **B. User Fee Cost Recovery Levels**

In setting user fees and cost recovery levels, the following factors will be considered:

1. ***Community-Wide Versus Special Benefit.*** The level of user fee cost recovery should consider the *community-wide* versus *special*

### **C. Factors Favoring Low Cost Recovery Levels**

Very low cost recovery levels are appropriate under the following circumstances:

1. There is *no* intended relationship between the amount paid and the benefit received. Almost all "social service" programs fall into this category as it is *expected* that one group will subsidize another.
2. Collecting fees is not cost-effective or will significantly impact the efficient delivery of the service.
3. There is *no* intent to limit the use of (or entitlement to) the service. Again, most "social service" programs fit into this category as well as many public safety (police and fire) emergency response services. Historically, access to neighborhood and community parks would also fit into this category.
4. The service is non-recurring, generally delivered on a "peak demand" or emergency basis, cannot reasonably be planned for on an individual basis, and is not readily available from a private sector source. Many public safety services also fall into this category.
5. Collecting fees would discourage compliance with regulatory requirements and adherence is primarily self-identified, and as such, failure to comply would not be readily detected by the City. Many small-scale licenses and permits might fall into this category.

**D. Factors Favoring High Cost Recovery Levels**

The use of service charges as a major source of funding service levels is especially appropriate under the following circumstances:

1. The service is similar to services provided through the private sector.
2. Other private or public sector alternatives could or do exist for the delivery of the service.
3. For equity or demand management purposes, it is intended that there be a direct relationship between the amount paid and the level and cost of the service received.

4. The use of the service is specifically discouraged. Police responses to disturbances or false alarms might fall into this category.
5. The service is regulatory in nature and voluntary compliance is not expected to be the primary method of detecting failure to meet regulatory requirements. Building permit, plan checks, and subdivision review fees for large projects would fall into this category.

**E. General Concepts Regarding the Use of Service Charges**

The following general concepts will be used in developing and implementing service charges:

1. Revenues should not exceed the reasonable cost of providing the service.
2. Cost recovery goals should be based on the total cost of delivering the service, including direct costs, departmental administration costs and organization-wide support costs such as accounting, personnel, information technology, legal services, fleet maintenance and insurance.
3. The method of assessing and collecting fees should be as simple as possible in order to reduce the administrative cost of collection.
4. Rate structures should be sensitive to the "market" for similar services as well as to smaller, infrequent users of the service.
5. A unified approach should be used in determining cost recovery levels for various programs based on the factors discussed above.

**F. Low Cost-Recovery Services**

Based on the criteria discussed above, the following types of services should have very low cost recovery goals. In selected circumstances, there may be specific activities within the broad scope of services provided that should have user charges associated with them. However, the primary source of funding for the

operation as a whole should be general-purpose revenues, not user fees.

1. Delivering public safety emergency response services such as police patrol services and fire suppression.
2. Maintaining and developing public facilities that are provided on a uniform, community-wide basis such as streets, parks and general-purpose buildings.
3. Providing social service programs and economic development activities.

**G. Recreation Programs**

The following cost recovery policies apply to the City's recreation programs:

1. Cost recovery for activities directed to adults should be relatively high.
2. Cost recovery for activities directed to youth and seniors should be relatively low. In those circumstances where services are similar to those provided in the private sector, cost recovery levels should be higher.

Although ability to pay may not be a concern for all youth and senior participants, these are desired program activities, and the cost of determining need may be greater than the cost of providing a uniform service fee structure to all participants. Further, there is a community-wide benefit in encouraging high-levels of participation in youth and senior recreation activities regardless of financial status.

3. Cost recovery goals for recreation activities are set as follows:

***High-Range Cost Recovery Activities  
(60% to 100%)***

- a. Adult athletics
- b. Banner permit applications
- c. Child care services (except Youth STAR)

- d. Facility rentals (indoor and outdoor; excludes use of facilities for internal City uses)
- e. Triathlon

***Mid-Range Cost Recovery Activities  
(30% to 60%)***

- f. Classes
- g. Holiday in the Plaza
- h. Major commercial film permit applications

***Low-Range Cost Recovery Activities  
(0 to 30%)***

- i. Aquatics
- j. Batting cages
- k. Community gardens
- l. Junior Ranger camp
- m. Minor commercial film permit applications
- n. Skate park
- o. Special events (except for Triathlon and Holiday in the Plaza)
- p. Youth sports
- q. Youth STAR
- r. Teen services
- s. Senior/boomer services

4. For cost recovery activities of less than 100%, there should be a differential in rates between residents and non-residents. However, the Director of Parks and Recreation is authorized to reduce or eliminate non-resident fee differentials when it can be demonstrated that:

- a. The fee is reducing attendance.
- b. And there are no appreciable expenditure savings from the reduced attendance.

5. Charges will be assessed for use of rooms, pools, gymnasiums, ball fields, special-use areas, and recreation equipment for activities not sponsored or co-sponsored by the City. Such charges will generally conform to the fee guidelines described above. However, the Director of Parks and Recreation is authorized to charge fees that are closer to full cost recovery for facilities that are heavily used at peak times and include a majority of non-resident users.

6. A vendor charge of at least 10 percent of gross income will be assessed from individuals or organizations using City facilities for moneymaking activities.
7. Director of Parks and Recreation is authorized to offer reduced fees such as introductory rates, family discounts and coupon discounts on a pilot basis (not to exceed 18 months) to promote new recreation programs or resurrect existing ones.
8. The Parks and Recreation Department will consider waiving fees only when the City Manager determines in writing that an undue hardship exists.

**H. Development Review Programs**

The following cost recovery policies apply to the development review programs:

1. Services provided under this category include:
  - a. Planning (planned development permits, tentative tract and parcel maps, rezonings, general plan amendments, variances, use permits).
  - b. Building and safety (building permits, structural plan checks, inspections).
  - c. Engineering (public improvement plan checks, inspections, subdivision requirements, encroachments).
  - d. Fire plan check.
2. Cost recovery for these services should generally be very high. In most instances, the City's cost recovery goal should be 100%.
3. However, in charging high cost recovery levels, the City needs to clearly establish and articulate standards for its performance in reviewing developer applications to ensure that there is "value for cost."

**I. Comparability With Other Communities**

In setting user fees, the City will consider fees charged by other agencies in accordance with the following criteria:

1. Surveying the comparability of the City's fees to other communities provides useful background information in setting fees for several reasons:
  - a. They reflect the "market" for these fees and can assist in assessing the reasonableness of San Luis Obispo's fees.
  - b. If prudently analyzed, they can serve as a benchmark for how cost-effectively San Luis Obispo provides its services.
2. However, fee surveys should never be the sole or primary criteria in setting City fees as there are many factors that affect how and why other communities have set their fees at their levels. For example:
  - a. What level of cost recovery is their fee intended to achieve compared with our cost recovery objectives?
  - b. What costs have been considered in computing the fees?
  - c. When was the last time that their fees were comprehensively evaluated?
  - d. What level of service do they provide compared with our service or performance standards?
  - e. Is their rate structure significantly different than ours and what is it intended to achieve?
3. These can be very difficult questions to address in fairly evaluating fees among different communities. As such, the comparability of our fees to other communities should be one factor among many that is considered in setting City fees.

**ENTERPRISE FUND FEES AND RATES**

- A. Water, Sewer and Parking.** The City will set fees and rates at levels which fully cover the total direct and indirect costs—including operations, capital outlay, and debt service—of the following enterprise programs: water, sewer and parking.

## Budget and Fiscal Policies

---

- B. **Golf.** Golf program fees and rates should fully cover direct operating costs. Because of the nine-hole nature of the golf course with its focus on youth and seniors, subsidies from the General Fund to cover indirect costs and capital improvements may be considered by the Council as part of the Financial Plan process, along with the need to possibly subsidize direct operating costs as well.
- C. **Transit.** Based on targets set under the Transportation Development Act, the City will strive to cover at least twenty percent of transit operating costs with fare revenues.
- D. **Ongoing Rate Review.** The City will review and adjust enterprise fees and rate structures as required to ensure that they remain appropriate and equitable.
- E. **Franchise Fees.** In accordance with long-standing practices, the City will treat the water and sewer funds in the same manner as if they were privately owned and operated. This means assessing reasonable franchise fees in fully recovering service costs.

At 3.5%, water and sewer franchise fees are based on the mid-point of the statewide standard for public utilities like electricity and gas (2% of gross revenues from operations) and cable television (5% of gross revenues).

As with other utilities, the purpose of the franchise fee is reasonable cost recovery for the use of the City's street right-of-way. The appropriateness of charging the water and sewer funds a reasonable franchise fee for the use of City streets is further supported by the results of recent studies in Arizona, California, Ohio and Vermont which concluded that the leading cause for street resurfacing and reconstruction is street cuts and trenching for utilities.

## CITY OF SACRAMENTO FEES AND CHARGES POLICY

The City of Sacramento has the ability to determine the extent to which fees should be used to fund City facilities, infrastructure and services.

There are five main categories of fees that the City currently implements<sup>1</sup>:

- ✓ **Impact/development fees** are typically one-time charges levied by the City against new development to generate revenue for the construction of infrastructure and capital facilities needed to offset the effects of the new development.
- ✓ **Service fees** are charges imposed on persons or property that are designed to offset the cost of providing a government service. Sometimes these services are elective, such as fees for processing voluntary development permit applications, or providing service/recreation programs, while other service fees are not, such as mandatory service fees for trash or utility services. Such fees are typically reasonably related to the cost of providing the service for which the fee is imposed. Otherwise, the fee may constitute a special tax for which voter approval is required by Propositions 13, 62, and 218.
- ✓ **Regulatory fees** are imposed to offset the cost of a regulatory program, such as business regulatory fees, or to mitigate the past, present or future adverse impact of a fee payer's operations. While payment of a regulatory fee does not necessarily provide any direct benefit from payment of the fee, there must be a "nexus" between the activity and the adverse consequences addressed by the fee. Common examples of regulatory fees include inspection fees and business license fees designed to reimburse a local agency for the cost of monitoring the business and enforcing compliance with City code.
- ✓ **Rental fees** are charged for the rental of public property and include the rental of real property, parking spaces in a public parking lot, or the rental of community facilities such as a recreation or community room or picnic area. Rental fees are not subject to the general rule that the fee must bear a direct relationship to the reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged however, rental fees must be fair and reasonable.
- ✓ **Penalties/Fines** are payment required for non-compliance or failure to adhere to specific rules and/or requirements.

This document sets forth guidelines for:

---

1 League of California Cities Website: Spring Meeting May 13-15, 1998 Laurence S. Wiener, Esq. City Attorney of Beverly Hills and Westlake Village **THE CITY ATTORNEY'S ROLE IN EVALUATING FEE STUDIES.**

- Establishing cost recovery goals;
- Determining the categories of cost recovery levels in which to categorize/organize fees;
- Methods for determining which category a fee falls under; and
- Establishment and modification of fees and charges.

## A. Cost Recovery Goals

In setting user fees and cost recovery levels, the following factors will be considered<sup>2</sup>:

- 1) The amount of a fee should not exceed the overall cost of providing the facility, infrastructure or service for which the fee is imposed. In calculating that cost, direct and indirect costs may be included. That is:
  - Costs which are directly related to the provision of the service; and,
  - Support costs which are more general in nature but provide support for the provision of the service. For example, service fees can include reimbursement for the administrative costs of providing the service. Development fees can include the cost of administering the program to construct public facilities that are necessary to serve new development.
- 2) The method of assessing and collecting fees should be as simple as possible in order to reduce the administrative cost of collection.
- 3) Fees should be sensitive to the “market” for similar services.

In addition, in setting enterprise fund fees and cost recovery levels, the following factors will be considered:

- 4) The City will set fees and rates at levels which fully cover the total direct and indirect costs, including operations, capital outlay and debt service of the enterprise programs.
- 5) The City will review and adjust enterprise fees and rate structures as required to ensure that they remain appropriate and equitable.

## B. Categories of Cost Recovery Levels in Which to Categorize/Organize Fees

There are five categories of cost recovery levels in which to classify fees:

1. **Enterprise:** Full direct and indirect cost recovery (100% of total costs) for enterprise services such as water, sewer and solid waste, as well as impact/development fees.
2. **High:** Full direct cost recovery (81-100% of total costs).

---

<sup>2</sup> Government Finance Officers Association Website, Best Practices in Public Budgeting, City of San Luis Obispo: User Fee Cost Recovery Goals, 2005.

3. **Medium:** Recovery between 41-80% of direct costs.
4. **Low:** Recovery between 0-40% of direct costs.
5. **Other:** Fees based on market, geography, assessment, project specific, legal limits or specific Council policy.

The City may choose, for policy reasons, to set fees at less than full recovery. For example, fees based on market, geography, assessment, project specific, statutory/legal limits or specific Council policy. In some cases, the City will acknowledge that a subsidy is acceptable, or even necessary to ensure program access and viability.

### **C. Methods for Determining Which Category a Fee Falls Under**

Implementation of higher cost recovery levels is appropriate under the following conditions (up to 100% of the cost of the service or program):

- The service is regulatory in nature (e.g. building permits, plan check fees);
- The service is similar to services provided through the private sector;
- Other private or public sector alternatives could or do exist for the delivery of the service;
- Over-use of the service is specifically discouraged (e.g. police responses to disturbances or false alarms might fall into this category).
- Over-use of the service or facility is a specialized use that could be provided at a lower cost if not for specific nature or service (e.g. lighted fields).

Lower cost recovery levels are appropriate under the following conditions:

- There is no intended relationship between the amount paid and the benefit received. (It is likely that some recreation and human service programs fall into this category as it is expected that these programs will be subsidized by funds);
- Collecting fees is not cost-effective or will significantly effects the accessibility to the service;
- The service is non-recurring, generally delivered on a peak demand or emergency basis, cannot be planned for and is not readily available from a private sector source (e.g. public safety services);
- Collecting fees would discourage compliance with regulatory requirements and adherence is primarily self-identified, and as such, failure to comply would not be readily detected by the City.

Other:

- Market pricing requires that there be a direct relationship between the amount paid and the level and cost of the service received or a direct relationship to actual prices being charged for the service in the current market.
- Legal specifications and/or limitations to the amount that is charged.

- Adopted Council Policy setting specific fee.

### Factors to Consider

The extent to which the total cost of service should be recovered through fees depends upon the following factors:

- ✓ The nature of the facilities, infrastructure or services;
- ✓ The nature and extent of the benefit to the fee payer;
- ✓ The effect of pricing on the demand for services; and
- ✓ The feasibility of collection and recovery.

The chart below reflects these factors and the potential options for higher or lower cost recovery<sup>3</sup>:

	<b>The Nature of the Facilities, Infrastructure or Services</b>	<b>The Nature and Extent of the Benefit to The Fee Payers</b>	<b>Effect of Pricing on the Demand for Services</b>	<b>Feasibility of Collection and Recovery</b>
<b>Higher Cost Recovery</b>	In the case of fees for facilities, infrastructure and proprietary services <sup>4</sup> , total cost recovery may be warranted.	When a particular facility or service results in substantial, immediate and direct benefit to fee payers, a higher percentage of the cost of providing the facility or service should be recovered by the fee.	Because the pricing of services can significantly affect demand, full cost recovery for services is more appropriate when the market for the services is strong and will support a high level of cost recovery.	In the case of impact fees, which can be collected at the time of issuance of a building permit, ease of collection is generally not a factor.
<b>Lower Cost Recovery</b>	In the case of governmental services <sup>5</sup> , it may be appropriate for a substantial portion of the cost of such services to be borne by the City's taxpayers, rather than the individual users of such services.	When a particular facility or service benefits not only the fee payer but also a substantial segment of the community, lower cost recovery is warranted.	If high levels of cost recovery affect accessibility to or negatively effect the delivery of services to lower income groups, this should be considered based on the overall goals of the program being implemented.	Some fees may prove to be impractical for the City to utilize if they are too costly to administer.

<sup>3</sup> Government Finance Officers Association Website, Best Practices in Public Budgeting, City of Fort Collins, CO: User Fee Policies, 2005.

<sup>4</sup> Proprietary services are those which are provided for the benefit and enjoyment of the residents of the City

<sup>5</sup> Governmental services are those which are provided by the City for the public good such as regulating land use, maintaining streets, and providing police and fire protection.

## **D. Establishment and Modification of Fees and Charges**

Fees will be reviewed and updated on an ongoing basis as part of the annual budget process to ensure that they keep pace with changes in the cost-of-living as well as changes in methods or levels of service delivery. At the beginning of the budget process each department will submit a list of proposed adjustments to their section of the master fee schedule. Each service must be assigned a target cost recovery level as defined above.

Maintaining competitive status and comparability with other cities should be considered when determining new fee levels. Those fees that are proposed for adjustment should be benchmarked against neighboring jurisdiction fee schedules or appropriate service markets. The benchmark analysis should be taken into consideration when making final pricing decisions.

However, the City may choose, for policy reasons, to set fees at less than full recovery. (for example, fees based on market, geography, assessment, project specific, statutory/legal limits or specific Council policy). As stated above, in some cases, the City will acknowledge that a subsidy is acceptable, or even necessary to ensure program access and viability. Where appropriate, fees that have not been increased in some time should have increases phased in over several years to avoid 'sticker shock' increases.

If a particular fee is not adjusted in the budget process, to the extent feasible and/or appropriate, it should be increased biennially by a CPI factor to keep pace with inflation. Beginning in FY2014/15 the City will use the State of California Department of Industrial Relations Consumer Price Index (CPI) which is the same index used by the County Assessor to adjust the annual property tax roll for inflation.

Biennially, the Finance Department shall determine the percentage change in this index and apply the increase or decrease to the master fee schedule, rounding up to the nearest whole dollar. Certain fees are exempt from an index adjustment, such as fees set by the State of California, percentage-based fees or those that have been identified as inappropriate for indexed fee increases (e.g. feasibility or fees that are based on market for services). Exempt fees are noted in the master fee schedule. Council may consider fee issues outside of the annual budget process on a case-by-case basis.

The City should conduct a comprehensive cost of service analysis every five to seven years to ensure fees and charges are set appropriately. Generally, fees may be adjusted based on supplemental analysis whenever there have been significant changes in the method, level or cost of service delivery. For example, changes in processes and technology change the staff time required to provide services to the public. A cost of service study will identify and quantify these changes.

**USER FEE COST RECOVERY LEVEL POLICY****BACKGROUND**

The City provides a variety of services to the public which benefit the entire community or individual residents or businesses. For certain services such as regulatory fees, arts and science classes, or recreational activities, the City traditionally has recovered partially or fully the cost for providing these services, which would have been otherwise paid from the General Fund.

Propositions 13, 218, and 26 have placed both substantive and procedural limits on cities' ability to impose fees and charges. Collectively these constitutional amendments provide safeguards against taxes being imposed without a vote of the people.

This policy was approved by the City Council on May 18, 2015 (CMR # 5735).

**POLICY STATEMENT**

It is the policy of the City of Palo Alto to set Municipal Fees based on cost recovery levels in lieu of fully subsidizing fee-related activities with General Fund dollars. The cost recovery levels are reflective of the following policy statements.

1. Community-wide vs. Private Benefit: Funding services such as Police patrol services only through taxpayer dollars is appropriate for services that benefit the entire community. When the service or program provides a benefit to specific individuals or businesses such as the issuance of building permits, it is expected that individuals or businesses receiving that benefit pay for all of the cost of that service.

2. Service Recipient vs. Community Benefit: For regulated activities such as development review and Police issued permits, it is appropriate that the service recipient such as an applicant of a building permit or a Pushcart Vendor permit pay for the permit although the community at large benefits from the regulation.

3. Consistency with City Goals and Policies: City policies and Council goals related to the community's quality of life are factors in setting cost recovery levels. For example, fee levels can be set to promote healthy habits, facilitate environmental stewardship, or discourage certain actions (e.g. false alarms).

4. Elasticity of Demand for Services: The level of cost recovery can affect the demand for services. A higher level of cost recovery could ensure the City is providing services such as recreational classes or summer camps for children and youth without over stimulating a market with artificially low prices. Such low prices, which are a reflection of a high General Fund subsidy, may result in huge waiting lists and attract participants from other cities; however, high cost recovery levels could negatively impact the demand for such services from low income individuals, special needs individuals, and seniors.

5. Availability of Services from the Private Sector: High cost recovery levels are generally sought in situations where the service is available from other sources in order to preserve taxpayer funds for other General Fund funded City services. Conversely, services that are not available from other sources and are typically delivered when residents experience an emergency basis typically have low or zero cost recovery levels.

Based on these policy statements, the table below overlays certain cost recovery levels grouped in low (0-30%), medium (30.1% to 70%), and high (70.1% to 100%) cost recovery percentage ranges. It is important to note that these groupings provide policy guidance and are not absolute. Some policy statements may weigh more heavily than others, which may result in a different cost recovery level grouping for particular fees. For example, fees for recreational activities are expected to be set in general at the medium cost recovery level. However, fees for recreational activities for which there is a high demand may have a high cost recovery level due to high enrollment levels per class. It is important to note that Municipal fees will be reviewed annually by the Finance Committee and subsequently by the City Council as part of approval of the Municipal Fee Schedule.

<b>Cost Recovery Level Group</b>	<b>Cost Recovery Percentage Range</b>	<b>Policy Considerations</b>
Low	0% - 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No intended relationship between the amount paid and the benefit received</li> <li>• Fee collection would not be cost effective and/or would discourage compliance with regulatory requirements</li> <li>• No intent to limit the use of the service</li> <li>• Public at large benefits even if they are not the direct users of the service</li> <li>• Affordability of service to low-income residents</li> </ul>
Medium	30.1% - 70%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services which promote healthy activities and educational enrichment to the community</li> <li>• Services having factors associated with the low and high cost recovery levels</li> </ul>
High	70.1% - 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual users or participants receive most or all of the benefit of the service</li> <li>• Other private or public sector alternatives provide the service</li> <li>• The use of the service is specifically discouraged</li> <li>• The service is regulatory in nature</li> </ul>



December 3, 2015

□ **Administration**

1035 Detroit Ave.  
Suite 200  
Concord, CA 94518  
p.(925) 676-5442  
f. (925) 825-2732

□ **West Area**

3220 Blume Dr  
Plaza One – Suite 139  
Richmond, CA 94806  
p.(510) 758-KIDY  
f. (510) 233-5445

□ **Central Area**

1035 Detroit Ave.  
Suite 200  
Concord, CA 94518  
p.(925) 676-KIDS  
f. (925) 265-6510

□ **East Area**

5095 Lone Tree Way  
Antioch, CA 94531  
p.(925) 778-KIDS  
f. (925) 778-6241

[CoCoKids.org](http://CoCoKids.org)

Dear City Councils,

The economic success of a community is founded in its' structural roots. The roots we speak of here are the abilities of families to secure safe, healthy and enriched learning environments for their young children in their own neighborhoods during their work hours. Employers have found that when a parent knows that their children are safe and well provided for in quality child care programs, their focuses change and these employees can then give 100% of their time and talents to the work environment. These very roots are being strangled out of existence due to the inability of families to find affordable child care in their own neighborhoods.

The most cost effective child care is found in family child care (FCC) homes. The overhead involved in FCC is much lower than in centers because this business takes place directly in the provider's home. The dilemma comes when a large facility relocates because the lease is up on the home they are using to run their business or the small FCC facility applies for a capacity increase to a large licensed facility. In both of these situations the provider is required to obtain a Use-Permit. The high costs of these Use-Permits are a great financial obstacle. In recent years, very few small FCC businesses increased their capacities. In fact, many small and large FCC businesses closed. Now that the economy overall is on the rise, we have providers finding themselves in one of the two situation just described. The fees involved have become cost prohibitive.

The FCC community recently brought this issue to the attention of the Contra Costa Child Care Council. We are hopeful that these fee schedules can be modified both by the county and the city councils. The California Health and Safety Codes 1597.46 (a) (3) inform us that "The local government shall process a required permit as economically as possible. Fees charged for review cannot exceed the costs of the review and permit process." The CA

## ATTACHMENT C

Codes further reveal: “1597.46 - All of the following shall apply to large family day care homes: (a) A city, county, or city and county shall not prohibit large family day care homes on lots zoned for single-family dwellings, but shall do one of the following; (1) Classify these homes as a permitted use of residential property for zoning purposes.” We would like to take this opportunity to petition the City Councils to follow 1597.46 and make changes by exempting, waiving or providing subsidies for these fees. Additionally, Article 1597.47 speaks to the fact that “the provisions of this chapter also shall not be construed to prohibit or restrict the abatement of nuisances by a city, county, or city and county. However, such ordinance or nuisance abatement shall not distinguish family child care facilities from other single-family dwellings, except as otherwise provided in this chapter”. We want to ask our Cities to take a close look at the way they are administering 1597.47 in non-discretionary permits. We have included a few case studies for further consideration.

Background information shows us that the capacity levels of the total current child care facilities do not meet the growing needs for affordable child care throughout our county. FCC businesses took the first blows as our economy collapsed in recent years, as one parent was displaced from the workforce child care was no longer needed by the family. Now that many parents are returning to work, we are finding a shortage of available licensed child care slots. In order to grow into a strong, healthy, family centered community, we must assure that the child care community once again is available for our families. The price of affordable child care cannot be placed on the backs of our child care workforce. FCC's are required to pay at least minimum wages to their employees, yet when calculations of their own annual taxable incomes are completed and total hours worked in their child care facilities are accounted for, the majority of FCC providers make less than minimum wage themselves. We are seeking equanimity, social justice for the field of family child care. Please take this request into consideration of the highest importance. The FCC community must be allowed to expand. Each time a small FCC increases their capacity to a large facility; this action equals another small family child care facility opening in a neighborhood. Existing facilities expanding have a far greater chance of succeeding than a new facility opening. It makes greater financial sense for our county and cities to embrace large FCC businesses. They allow our communities to grow with no true negative impact on our neighborhoods.

## **ATTACHMENT C**

Individual zoning requirements of each city in Contra Costa have very differing costs for the Use-Permits for large FCC microenterprises. We are asking that all our cities take another look at what they can do to resolve this problem. Many cities across California have found ways to subsidize or exempt, even waive these costs for large FCC. FCC must stay affordable in every neighborhood for our families. Child Care poses the second largest expense to families coming in second only to the cost of housing. Child care is a service to working families and the child care industry cannot further burden the families by passing on these expenses because increasing the costs of care will result in the loss of affordable child care for families. We ask that you take our request into consideration. Please exempt our large FCC facilities from Use-Permit fees.

Sincerely,

Toni Robertson  
Quality Improvement Facilitator  
[toni.robertson@cocokids.org](mailto:toni.robertson@cocokids.org)  
(925) 265-6450

Enclosure: Zoning Permits - Case Studies

## **Zoning Permits – Case Studies**

### **Case Study # 1**

#1 – Is a husband and wife who together run a large family child care in Concord. They have lived in Concord for many years and began family child care in 2006 in a home that they owned. In 2007 they increased their capacity from a small family child care to a large. They lost their home in 2012. Their next home was leased and their large FCC facility was licensed in December of 2012. This lease ended in March 2015. They moved in April 2015 and their new location is a home leased for three years located just one street over from their last home/large family child care facility. (Children from the licensed facility can move with the provider to a new location pending CCLD clearance of the new site and the issuance of the new facility license. No advertising of the family child care can take place until the new license is issued. New children cannot be added until the new facility is issued the new license.) 1) They filed the application with CCL. 2) They are waiting for the visit for clearance by the State Fire Marshall. 3) They have visited the City of Concord Local Planning Department to apply for the required Use-Permit. They found that the cost for the Use Permit was: Current Planning Fee - \$730.00, Current Building Fee - \$172.00, and an additional charge of \$250.00 to “give notice of the proposed use by mail or delivery to all owners shown on the last equalized assessment roll as owning real property within a 100-foot radius of the exterior boundaries of the proposed large family child care home”. In Concord the fees for large family child care Use-Permits are \$1152.00. This family child care has never had to pay for this Use-Permit before for any of their previous locations over the past nine years of running a large family child care in Concord. The costs of the Use-Permit are financially a hardship for this small business and family. They are waiting for the facility to be licensed. Until they are licensed they cannot be reimbursed for the Federal Food Program sponsored by the Contra Costa Child Care Council, representing an additional financial hardship and they cannot fill the vacancies in their child care (a further financial hardship). They were told by the City of Concord that the expected length of time it will take for the city to process this Use Permit will be 3-6 months, once again another hardship for this provider. They need their license because this family child care income is the only source of income for their family.

**Case Study # 2**

#2 - Is a large family child care from Walnut Creek that has relocated her business in the City of Concord in September 2015. She moved with six of the 14 children she was licensed for in Walnut Creek (a practice allowed by CCLD.) She has three children that will be leaving her program in December. She was told by the City of Concord that the fees she would have to pay are \$1700. This provider cannot afford these fees! She is a provider that participates in the National Nutrition Program which reimburses licensed providers for serving nutritious food to the children in her care. This provider cannot be reimbursed until her new license is issued. She was told by the City of Concord that the Use-Permit will take 3-6 months to process. I advised this provider to submit a licensing application for small family child care so she can fill the vacancies in her child care and be reimbursed by the nutrition program. I further advised her that as soon as she receives her small license, she should immediately send in an application to increase her facility to large capacity. This does represent the costs of extra licensing fees but losing children during this lengthy process has left this provider with no other options. The City of Concord has caused an undue hardship on this provider through the great expenses charged for the Use Permit and the length of time it takes for them to process these permits.

**Case Study # 3**

FCC #3 – Was a small family child care provider who increased her capacity to large family child care. She had her garage finished off her for additional play space for the children in her care. Licensing accepted the increased space and cleared her increase in capacity to 12 children plus the 2 school age option. She received clearance from the State Fire Marshall. The City of Walnut charged her \$3000.00 for her Use-Permit. They required her to remove the flooring that she had placed down in the floor of her garage. She was further restricted to only allowing three children to be in the backyard at any given time. She came into our office just before the final inspection by the city. This is when our Quality Improvement Facilitator informed her of her rights and provided her with the California Health and Safety Codes that govern our cities and counties regarding large family child care. Community Care Licensing overrides local and county jurisdictions when it comes to licensed child care facilities. Cities cannot make rules in residential areas that only apply to the family child care facilities in those areas if they do not apply to other households. The fact that all other residential homes are not restricted to only three children

playing in their yards is a violation of her rights. The fact that any other homeowner can resurface their garage floors with flooring of their choice is another violation of this homeowner's rights. These rules must follow the California Code – Health and Safety Code section 1597.30-1597.621.

One day when this provider had less than six children (large licenses are not required by community care licensing to have an assistant when the total children present do not exceed the numbers a small facility can have) she was outside with all six children, one being an infant in her arms. She received a call from the Planning Division of the City of Walnut Creek (Use-Permit department) who said that the neighbor had called and that she could not be outside with more than three children. She explained that she did not have and was not required to have an assistant this day because she had so few children. She was informed that the planning department would have to reopen her case and that she would be charged more money for not abiding by the rules that they had agreed to on the non-discretionary permit that was issued to her. This provider has already paid the City of Walnut Creek \$3000.00, thus far, to be able to have a large family child care facility.

### **Case Study # 4**

#4 – Is a large family child care provider who leased a home in a new location and relocated her large family child care facility, once again in Pittsburg. She paid the \$2000.00 Use –Permit fee. After living in this home for a very short time, the provider realized that the railroad tracks that were adjacent to the back of the property she was leasing were kicking up excess dust triggering asthma attacks and crises for her and several of the children under her care, which become a major health issues directly related to this location. The provider cannot relocate her home again because of the cost involved in obtaining a new Use-Permit.